

APR 26 1941

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
POTTLE, F. A.—The Dark Hints of Sir John Hawkins and Boswell, . . .	325
GREEN, H. J.—Fromont, a Traitor in the 'Chansons de geste,' . . .	329
FEUILLERAT, ALBERT.—Sur deux lettres de Baudelaire, . . .	338
BALDENSPERGER, FERNAND.—A propos de "Nathaniel Hawthorne en France," . . .	343
BÜHLER, C. F.—Sir John Paston's 'Grete Booke,' a Fifteenth-Century "Best-Seller," . . .	345
BÜHLER, C. F.—Astrological Prognostications in MS. 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library, . . .	351
MALONE, KEMP.—Hygd, . . .	358
CLARK, E. M.—A Restored Reading in the Towneley Purification Play, . . .	358
WOLFE, D. M.—Lilburne's Note on Milton, . . .	360
COON, A. M.—Isaak Walton a Stationer?, . . .	363
CARLETON, P. D.—John Donne's "Bracelet of Bright Hair About the Bone," . . .	366
NIEMEYER, CARL.—A Misdating of "A Ballade Upon a Wedding," . . .	368
GRAHAM, C. B.—The Jonsonian Tradition in the Comedies of John Dennis, . . .	370
WILSON, J. H.—Rochester's "Buffoon Conceit," . . .	372
LANG, VARLEY.—The Character in the Elia Essays, . . .	374
PETTIT, HENRY.—Coleridge's Mount Abora, . . .	376
PAY, E. G.—Borrowings from Anatole France by Willa Cather and Robert Nathan, . . .	377

## REVIEWS:—

J. C. METCALF, De Quincey; G. M. YOUNG, The Age of Tennyson; BERNARD GROOM, On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning and Arnold; E. K. CHAMBERS, Arnold. [H. A. Eaton.] . . .	378
A. H. NETHERCOT, The Road to Tryermaine. [Mario Pras.] . . .	381
R. PASCAL (ed.), Shakespeare in Germany 1750-1815; M. DEUTSCHBEIN, Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama des Barock; P. W. BIESTER-FELDT, Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds; H. ARNEKE, Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England. [P. P. Kies.] . . .	385
W. Y. TINDALL, D. H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow; CLEANTH BROOKS, Modern Poetry and the Tradition. [R. P. Blackmur.] . . .	388
H. B. WOOLF, The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving. [A. H. Marckwardt.] . . .	300
J. H. HANFORD, A Milton Handbook; J. M. FRENCH, Milton in Chancery; G. W. WHITING, Milton's Literary Milieu. [W. R. Parker.] . . .	392
W. B. C. WATKINS, Perilous Balance: The Tragic Genius of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne. [F. A. Pottle.] . . .	394
SISTER EUGENIA LOGAN, A Concordance to the Poetry of S. T. Coleridge; P. GRAHAM and J. JONES, A Concordance to the Poems of Sidney Lanier. [Lane Cooper.] . . .	396
KATHRYN G. DUFF, George Keate, Esq. [E. W. Manwaring.] . . .	398
P. F. BAUM (ed.), Letters of D. G. Rossetti to Fanny Cornforth. [J. C. Trowell.] . . .	399
G. E. JENSEN, The Life and Letters of H. C. Bunner. [H. E. Spivey.] . . .	400
BRIEF MENTION; H. M. and N. E. CHADWICK, The Growth of Literature, vol. III; SISTER MARIE PIERRE KOCH, An Analysis of the Long Prayers in Old French Literature, . . .	401
CORRESPONDENCE: Locomotive et Automobile, . . .	403

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feiss, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00  
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries  
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Footnotes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

The General Index of volumes 1 to 50, xii + 310 pages, was published  
in December 1935. The price is \$5.00 net.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

## A HISTORY OF FRENCH DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

PART IV, THE PERIOD OF RACINE  
1673—1700

By HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER

*Professor of French Literature in the Johns Hopkins University*

In two volumes, 996 pages, cloth, \$10

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1102,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

tsor

ors  
the  
ript  
cles  
the  
of  
uo-  
not  
P.,  
ors  
ean



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LVI

MAY, 1941

Number 5

---

## THE DARK HINTS OF SIR JOHN HAWKINS AND BOSWELL

No portion of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, as he foresaw, has been so unpopular with the commentators as that in which he attributes Johnson's agonies of remorse in his last days to the recollection of sexual irregularities into which he had been led by Savage years before.<sup>1</sup> Croker feels obliged to declare his opinion that "Boswell's introduction of this topic, his pretended candour, and hollow defence, were unwarranted by any evidence, and are the most, indeed almost the only, discreditable parts of his whole work." In another note he is even more condemnatory: he speaks of "sinister authority," "low and filthy guilt," "calumniated friend," "hearsay or . . . guess," and concludes that "Boswell's good sense, good taste, and good feeling, must have . . . given way under some powerful self-delusion."<sup>2</sup> Fitzgerald expands this into an explicit charge that Boswell gratuitously inserted the passage to pay off Johnson for not remembering him in his will, and to sanction his own shortcomings.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Hill is silent, but Dr. Powell says the whole thing comes down to "vague insinuations."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill and L. F. Powell, 1934, iv. 395-8. (Hereafter referred to as *Life*.)

<sup>2</sup> *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. J. W. Croker, 1831, v. 306 n. 1, 309 n. 1. In the (later) one-vol. edition the notes are somewhat different, but no less violent.

<sup>3</sup> Percy Fitzgerald, *Boswell's Autobiography*, 1912, pp. 265-71. No one who knows Fitzgerald will be surprised to find that this reverses his earlier opinion in his edition of the *Life* (1874, iii. 157, n. 1). There he thought that "the evidence of Hawkins and Boswell, who had seen [Johnson's] private diaries, is more to be relied on than such speculations as Mr. Croker's."

<sup>4</sup> *Life*, iii. 552.

Mr. W. B. C. Watkins has reopened the discussion in his recent study of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne (*Perilous Balance*, cf. below, pp. 394-5). He does real service by bringing out clearly the fact that Hawkins first made the charge, and that Boswell, though he wrote at greater length, really says no more than his predecessor. His conclusion is that "while it is possible that Boswell refers to some secret confidence, it seems fairly clear that Hawkins is merely making the rash assumption on the basis that Johnson knew intimately a man of dissolute morals. . . . His sense of sin is explicable on other grounds."<sup>5</sup>

The topic is an ungracious one, but since it is apparently always going to be discussed, we had better have somewhere a full and detached statement of the evidence so far as Hawkins and Boswell are concerned. Mr. Watkins does not take into account material in Boswell's journal that is much to the point.

In the first place, I think we can dismiss the suggestion of a secret confidence. So far as is known, Boswell never heard from Johnson himself any confession of sexual irregularity, and there is no record that he ever questioned him on the subject. He told Sir John Pringle in 1776 that he did not dare to.<sup>6</sup> Peter Garrick—not a very close friend of Johnson—told Boswell in 1775 that it was suspected that Johnson had seduced "a Lady, a very fine woman"; this Boswell thought "not very probable."<sup>7</sup> It does not appear that he had from any of Johnson's intimate friends any trustworthy evidence for his guarded and apparently reluctant statement that Johnson "after he came to London, and had associated with Savage and others, was not so strictly virtuous, in one respect, as when he was a younger man."<sup>8</sup>

I have no doubt that his authority was Hawkins. On 7 May 1785 Boswell met Hawkins at Bennet Langton's. His journal for that day has the following:

"Sir J. Hawkins and I did very well. Stood in a corner, and talked grave and earnest. He accounted for Johnson's fear of death: 'I have read his diary. I wish I had not read so much. He

<sup>5</sup> W. B. C. Watkins, *Perilous Balance*, 1939, pp. 51, 53.

<sup>6</sup> *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*, 1928-34, xi. 233 (10 April 1776). (Hereafter referred to as *Private Papers*.)

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, x. 142 (24 March 1775).

<sup>8</sup> *Life*, iv. 395.

had strong amorous passions.' Bos. 'But he did not indulge them?' HAWK. 'I have said enough.'"<sup>9</sup>

In his entry for 8 July of the next year, the day before he began the composition of the *Life*, occurs the following cryptic sentence:

"Drank tea at Langton's and had a conference with him and Sir John Hawkins upon a delicate question, which Langton assured me I weighed and decided upon as well as he could suppose it to be done."<sup>10</sup>

The language of the *Life* is reminiscent of these passages. "I am to mention (with all possible respect and *delicacy*, however) that his conduct. . . . It was well known that his *amorous inclinations* were uncommonly strong and impetuous."

It is of the first importance to know what Hawkins had read, but I fear that certainty is impossible. The fragmentary private diaries now known to exist contain nothing to support his charge, though it should be noted that none of them covers the period of Johnson's early life in London. We know, however, from Boswell that Johnson had another record, "a full, fair, and most particular account of his own life" in two quarto volumes. Boswell was not speaking on hearsay; he had once accidentally seen and had surreptitiously read "a great deal" in them, but as he confessed his guilt to Johnson, who treated him "placidly," it is not likely that he found anything discreditable.<sup>11</sup> Hawkins also looked into at least one of these volumes, and it may be that he perused it. According to his own account he went on Sunday 5 December 1784, eight days before Johnson's death, to partake the Holy Communion with him. Several other people had been invited: Hoole, his wife and son, Langton, Mrs. Gardiner, young Desmoulins, Frank the negro, and the Reverend George Strahan, who officiated. While Johnson was dressing and preparing himself, he missed a paper containing instructions to his executors, and several of the company went into his bedroom to search for it. Hawkins came upon a parchment-covered book, and opened it, thinking the paper might be inside. Finding it to be "meditations and reflections" in Johnson's hand, he slipped it into his pocket, together with a lesser MS. book of Johnson's, his excuse being that he wished to secure it from George Steevens, who would have got it if he could,

<sup>9</sup> *Private Papers*, xvi. 84.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, xvi. 203 (8 July 1786).

<sup>11</sup> *Life*, iv. 405-6.

and would have "made an ill use of it." He however told Langton and Strahan what he had done; Langton warned Johnson. As soon as the celebration was over (that is, at the first possible moment) Johnson, in great agitation, demanded the book back.<sup>12</sup> The two quarto volumes disappeared, having been burnt, as Boswell believed, by Johnson himself.<sup>13</sup>

Every man will judge of the value of this. It can be said that Hawkins was a puritan, a prig, and a good deal of an ass; that he was quite capable of reading into the existing diaries something that was not there; that, in spite of what Boswell says, it is not certain that the volumes he pocketed were the "particular account"; that even if they were, he did not have time or opportunity really to read them (he told Boswell he wished he "had not read so much"), etc., etc. It can also be argued that the conference between Hawkins, Langton, and Boswell had nothing to do with the matter under discussion. It took place in the summer of 1786, a year before Hawkins published his biography. Why should not Boswell have waited to see what his rival would say? Under the circumstances, would Hawkins have told him anything?

For my own part I cannot think Hawkins so hasty or Boswell so credulous. Both men, I think, would have preferred not to find anything of the kind. It is easier for me to believe that Sir John lied about the length of time that he had the lost journal in his possession than that his hints to Boswell were baseless. For that matter, if he had opened the book at the right place, he might have needed no more than a few seconds to read something that would have made him wish he "had not read so much." It is undoubtedly odd that Boswell should have read "a great deal" in the same record without finding anything of the kind that shocked Sir John.

<sup>12</sup> (Sir) John Hawkins, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 2d ed., 1787, p. 586. It is interesting and perhaps important to note that none of this was in his first edition. Hawkins does not name Steevens, but as Boswell says, describes him "so as to make it sufficiently clear who is meant." His daughter, Lætitia Matilda Hawkins, supplies the name (*Memoirs*, i. 265). The material from Hawkins, with Boswell's commentary, is conveniently found in G. B. Hill's *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, 1897, ii. 128-30. The list of persons who were present at the celebration is partly from Hawkins and partly from John Hoole's narrative (*Ibid.*, ii. 155).

<sup>13</sup> See note 11.

I am well aware of the danger of connecting the conference in Langton's presence with the earlier conversation. Hawkins and Boswell no doubt had many "delicate" questions to discuss. I can only say that the parallelism in wording between the journal and the *Life* is most suggestive. The entry for 8 July 1786 occurs in a fully written portion of the journal; its cryptic quality is not at all due to a wish for condensation. Boswell is deliberately concealing something, a practice very rare with him. I should say that there are not above half a dozen places in his entire record in which he shows such caution. Caution in Boswell's journal generally means that some other person is involved; as for himself, he had a feeling that he wished nothing concerning himself to be kept secret. My own interpretation of this entry is that he arranged the meeting with Hawkins in order to ask him *what* he had read in the diary, taking care to have Langton present, not merely because Hawkins thought better of Langton than of most men, but also because Langton knew all about the pocketed book. I believe that Hawkins was persuaded to talk, and that Boswell, after "weighing" what he was told "decided" that the facts were as he adumbrates them in the *Life*.<sup>14</sup>

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

#### FROMONT, A TRAITOR IN THE CHANSONS DE GESTE

A character by the name of Fromont plays a rôle of the first importance in *Garin le Loherain* and throughout the entire *Loherain* cycle of which *Garin* forms the nucleus.<sup>1</sup> We also find a Fro-

<sup>14</sup> I have not referred to the passage from *Thraliana* which Dr. Powell quotes in this connection (*Life*, iv. 552), because I read it differently. Mrs. Thrale does not mean to say that Johnson confessed to having been under the dominion of "some Woman" at a period of his life before she knew him. She herself is the woman, and Johnson came under her dominion (put himself in her power) by trusting her "with a Secret far dearer to him than his *Life*." The nature of the secret is not revealed. Professor Balderston, on the evidence of other passages in *Thraliana*, thinks it was a confession that he feared insanity, or thought he had been insane. See her forthcoming edition, p. 384 n. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my edition of *Ansej's de Mes* (Paris, 1939), genealogical table and chap. 1; see also *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, Paris; H. Welter, 1895,

mont in the principal villainous role in *Jourdain de Blaivies*.<sup>2</sup> In *Berthe aus grans piés*<sup>3</sup> a reference is made to this character from the *Loherain* cycle, while in *Gaydon*<sup>4</sup> there is mention of 'Fromont dou gaut foillu,' by which is doubtless meant the forest at Lens where Begon was killed. Langlois, probably on the strength of this, considers him as belonging to the 'lignage des traîtres.'<sup>5</sup> Fromonts are mentioned also in *Ogier le Danois*, *Raoul de Cambrai*, and *Otinél*, but in this latter group there is nothing in the poem to indicate whether they are traitors or sympathetic personages. They are merely spoken of as knights who are killed in battle or are present at the court of Charlemagne.<sup>6</sup> Finally, this traitor appears again in the Dutch poem *Les Enfants de Limbourg*. Huet believes that here the character is borrowed from the Dutch version of the *Loherain* cycle.<sup>7</sup>

What is the origin of this notorious personality who left so important an imprint upon the literature of the Middle Ages? Did he have any real existence or was he merely a creation of one of the writers of *chansons de geste*?

The writer of this article has long been interested in the question of an historical basis for the *Loherain* cycle. It will be remembered that Ferdinand Lot studied this problem in his article *L'Elément historique de Garin le Lorrain*. He reluctantly came to the conclusion that this historical basis was non-existent.<sup>8</sup> He was able to identify several very minor characters, 'des comparses,' with some real persons of the late 12th century, but admitted that they might be interpolations of copyists.<sup>9</sup> This subject has also been treated to some extent in my edition of *Anseïjs de Mes*.<sup>10</sup> In an effort to clarify this matter a little further I have consulted a number of Latin

xxii, 604 ff. For a discussion of the name Fromont in the *chansons de geste* see R. K. Bowman, *The Connection of the Geste des Loherains with other French Epics and Medieval Genres* (New York: 1940), pp. 81-85.

<sup>2</sup> E. Langlois, *Table des noms propres de toute nature compris dans les chansons de geste* (Paris: Emile Bouillon, 1904), pp. 242-243.

<sup>3</sup> *Berthe aus grans piés*, ed. A. Scheler (Bruxelles: Closson et Cie., 1874), p. 91; *Gaydon*, ed. F. Guessard (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1859), p. 207.

<sup>4</sup> G. Huet, "La Version néerlandaise des Lorrains; Nouvelles études," *Romania*, xxxiv, 1905, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> F. Lot, *L'Elément historique de Garin le Lorrain*, in *Etudes d'histoire au Moyen-Age* (Paris: Cerf et Alcan, 1896), pp. 201 and 215.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 201 and 211.

<sup>7</sup> *Anseïjs*, chap. VIII.

chronicles in Migne's *Patrologia*, as a result of which the following was brought to light:

According to the Annals of Flodoard<sup>8</sup> (894-966?), in the year 941, Fromont, count of Sens, arbitrarily unseated Gerlan, the archbishop of that city, because the latter had shown favor to one Wallon, whose suzerain, Count Herbert of Champagne, had previously expelled Fromont from the same city.<sup>9</sup>

Next there occurred an excommunication launched against Rainard, count of Sens, and his son Rodmundus or Frotmundus. This forms part of a group of works called *Appendix Actorum Veterum*, forming a supplement to *Regino Priemiensis Abbas*.<sup>10</sup> Neither the date nor the precise reasons for the excommunication are given. The editor of this chronicle here comes to our assistance, however. Basing his arguments on quotations from two chronicles, i. e. *Spicilegium Dacheriani*, vol. 10, p. 635, and *Chronicon sancti Petri Senonensis*, he furnishes the missing information.<sup>11</sup>

It appears that in 976 the archbishop died, and Rainardus wanted the position to pass into his own immediate family.<sup>12</sup> When, despite the count's delaying tactics, one Seguin was elected and consecrated, the former forbade the new archbishop the approaches

<sup>8</sup> Flodoardus canonicus Remensis—*Annales* in J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus*, Paris: Garnier Frères, 1879, cxxxv.

<sup>9</sup> 'Gerlanus Senonensis Archiepiscopus urbe sua depellitur a Frotmundo quem Hugo Albus eidem civitati praefecerat, culpato Gerlando quod Waloni faverit, homini Heriberti comitis, qui Frotmundum vel suos a praefata expulerat urbe.' *Ibid.*, col. 456, year DCCCCXLI.

<sup>10</sup> This Appendix was compiled by Stéphane Baluze (1630-1718) and appears in Migne, *op. cit.*, vol. 132, col. 473 ff. For Rodmundum = Frotmundum, see n. 13 below.

<sup>11</sup> 'Quia tamen satis hactenus cognitum non fuit quo tempore ea [i. e. excommunicatio ista] lata sit, quamve ob causam, cum praeterea res sit quae maxime pertinet ad institutum nostrum, visum est illam hic recudere cum observationibus nostris.' *Ibid.*, col. 473. I was unable to locate the chronicles which Stéphane Baluze quotes, viz. the *Spicilegium* and *Chronicon sancti Petri* mentioned above. It will be noted, however, in what detail his interpretation is corroborated by other chronicles which I quote below, and of which Baluze must presumably have been unaware, since he does not quote them.

<sup>12</sup> 'Anno DCCCCLXXVI, cum Anastasius Senonensis archiepiscopus obiisset, Ragenardus urbis illius comes, qui pontificatum in familiam suam inferre cupiebat, novi antistitis electionem turbavit spatio quinque mensium.' *Ibid.*, col. 473.

to the city of Sens, although this incumbent was the count's own nephew. The prelate's reply was to put the entire province of Sens under an interdict, and to proclaim the aforementioned excommunication.<sup>13</sup>

However, many years later, long after this controversy had died down, the succession to the archbishopric of Sens caused a new tempest, almost exactly similar to the previous one.

In 999 Seguin died. Shortly before this, Rainard had died, and had been succeeded by his son Fromont, who now wished the post for his son Bruno. A number of other ambitious clerics angled for the position, so that a veritable schism occurred.<sup>14</sup> When the electors chose one Leodoric, Fromont resorted to the same tactics which his father had previously employed against Seguin.<sup>14</sup> According to our editor, since the situation was exactly parallel to that of 976, the same excommunication was used, only the names being changed.<sup>15</sup>

Then there is an account by Rodulfus Glaber (c. 1048) in which we are told how in 1008 the aforementioned Leodoric found some holy relics that immediately began to perform miracles.<sup>16</sup> Sens

<sup>13</sup> 'Tandem Seguinus, filius sororis eiusdem Ragenardi, eo invito electus et consecratus apud Autissiodorum est III idus Junii. Venientem deinde eum Senonas Ragenardus aditu urbis prohibuit. Videns hoc autem ipse archiepiscopus ut ait Clarius in Chronico sancti Petri Vivi Senonensis, omnem provinciam interdixit a Kalendis Octobris usque in caput jejunii. Eo igitur tempore facta est ista excommunicatio adversus Ragenardum comitem et Rodmundum eius filium (quem Frotmundum vocat idem Clarius) quia Seguinum, postquam archiepiscopalem benedictionem suscepit, sanctum Sennensis ecclesiae locum ingredi non permiserant, ut legitur in excommunicatione.' *Ibid.*, col. 473.

<sup>14</sup> 'Post mortem Seguini, quae anno DCCCCLXXXIX contigit xvi Kal. Novembri, rursum tempestas in Ecclesia Senonensi. Nam cum Frotmundus comes qui Ragenardo patri non ita multo ante successerat, Brunonem filium Senonibus dari vellet episcopum, eodemque tempore plurimi etiam clericorum (ut Clarius ait) id est, canonicorum, ambitionibus episcopatum appeterent, ingens schisma facta est in Ecclesia, quia neque Bruno neque ullus canonicorum qui episcopari volebant ad eam dignitatem pervenire potuit, eligentium votis in Leothericum archidiaconum convenientibus. Ea de causa Frotmundus adversus ipsum commotus, ei post consecrationem ad sedem suam accedenti portas clausit et urbis introitum denegavit, ut legitur apud Tavellum.' *Ibid.*, col. 473.

<sup>15</sup> 'Cum ergo eadem tum excommunicandi causae essent quae Seguinum adegerant ista decernere adversus Ragenardum eius filium, placuit uti eadem formula mutatis nominibus.' *Ibid.*, col. 473.

<sup>16</sup> Rodulfus Glaber, *Cluniacensis Monachus*, in Migne, *op. cit.*, cxxlii, col. 655.

became a tourist attraction, therefore very opulent. Because of this new found prosperity the inhabitants grew very arrogant.<sup>16</sup> The worst offender in this respect, however, was the count himself, Rainard, who had succeeded his father Fromont.<sup>17</sup> This Rainard is described as a detractor of the Christian faith and pitiless in his dealings with the poor. Furthermore, he was a renegade and 'followed the false customs of the Jews.'<sup>18</sup> For this reason the king, who had frequently cautioned him because of his iniquitous ways, was finally persuaded to send a punitive expedition against him, adding Sens to the royal domain. Rainard was then ejected from his city which was sacked and burned.<sup>19</sup>

Another chronicler, Hugo de Sancta Maria (c. 1117), recounts the events of the year 999, mentioned above as having led to the excommunication of Fromont of Sens, in somewhat greater detail.

Old Rainard, after having perpetrated many evil deeds, died in 996, and was succeeded by his son Fromont.<sup>20</sup> Leodoric, the people's

<sup>17</sup> '... nimium quippe flagitiosus effectus, ecclesiae insuper decus, nisu quo valebat foedere tentabat.' *Ibid.*, col. 656.

<sup>18</sup> 'Judaeorum quoque in tantum praevaricatorias diligebat consuetudines, ut se regem ipsorum suo praenomine, Rainardus quippe dicebatur, suis omnibus imperaret. Cum enim in caeteris mendacissimus, etiam Christianae fidei insidiosus habebatur detractor. Atque ideo pauperum indicia absque ulla promulgabat pietate, penitus humanitate remota.' *Ibid.*, col. 656. 'He loved so greatly the customs and prevarications of the Jews that he ordered all his people [to give him] as a prenom [the title of] King of the Jews (ipsorum). For, since he was in other matters a great liar, he also was held to be an insidious detractor of the Christian religion. He also pronounced against the poor judgments devoid of any [feeling of] pity or humanity.' See also note 19, 'Rainardo . . . judaizante.'

<sup>19</sup> 'Praeterea Rainardo, ut diximus, judaizante, quin potius insaniante, suusum est regi, qui videlicet illum frequenter ob suam improbitatem redarguerat, ut scilicet tantae civitatis principatum regio subjugaret dominio, ne siquidem diutius vires pessimi incrementi sumeret scandalum sacrae fidei. Qua ratione rex compulsus, misit exercitum, qui praedictum Rainardum a civitati pellerent, sibique illam tuendam servarent. Venientes vero qui missi fuerant a rege, ceperunt urbem cum nimia depopulatione, partem etiam eius non modicam incendio cremavere.' *Ibid.*, 657.

<sup>20</sup> Hugo de Sancta Maria, *Floriacensis Monachus*, in Migne, *op. cit.*, CLXIII. 'Igitur Rainaldus comes vetulus Senonum post multa perpetrata mala defunctus est . . . cui successit Frotmundus, filius eius . . .' col. 862, 863.

choice for bishop, was opposed by several ambitious candidates. Fromont, 'who stemmed from a bad race,' was especially relentless in his opposition because he wanted the appointment of his own son Bruno. Nevertheless, Leodoric was elected.<sup>21</sup>

Upon the death of Fromont, his son Rainard succeeded him. The latter, 'a worthless infidel, persecuted the Christian Church and its faithful with a fury unheard of from the days of the Pagans to this very day.' Archbishop Leodoric, not knowing which way to turn, prayed to Christ for His divine intercession.<sup>22</sup> Thereupon, at the advice of the Bishop of Paris, Sens was sacked and given over to King Robert and Leodoric. Rainard fled naked from the city. His brother Fromont, who, together with some soldiers, offered continued resistance to the king, was captured and imprisoned in Orleans, where he died.<sup>23</sup> This recital from Hugo de Sancta Maria appears in literally identical form in Ordericus Vitalis

<sup>21</sup> 'At clamabat autem omnis populus sibi ordinari domnum Leothericum, nobilissimis ortum natalibus, tunc archidiaconum, omni bonitate conspicuum; sed resistebant quam plurimi clerici, cupientes episcopalem conscendere gradum. Praecipue vero Frotmundus comes, filius Rainaldi vetuli, natus ex mala radice, hoc non permittebat fieri, eo quod haberet filium clericum, nomine Brunonem, volens de eo facere episcopum. Dei autem nutu congregati suffraganei episcopi Senonicae ecclesiae, cum voluntate et auctoritate apostolica, sublato omni timore humano, sollemniter ordinarunt domnum Leothericum in sede pontificali, ut preesset ecclesiae Senonensi.' Col. 864.

<sup>22</sup> 'Mortuo itaque Frotmundo comite Senonum, successit ei Rainardus, filius eius, infidelium nequissimus. Hic persecutionem intulit ecclesiis Christi et fidelibus eius, quanta non est audita a tempore paganorum usque in hodiernum diem. Archiepiscopus autem Leothericus nimis angustatus pro hac re, quo se verteret omnino nesciebat. Totum vero se Domino comittens, in orationibus et vigiliis exorabat Christum ut ei superna pietas auxilium ministraret.' col. 864.

<sup>23</sup> 'Igitur anno a passione Domine MXV, indictione XIII, X Kal. Maii capta est civitas Senonum ab archiepiscopo Leotherico per consilium Rainardi Parisiensis presulis, et regi tradita Roberto. Rainardus comes eiusdem urbis fugiens nudus evasit. [Nec immerito. Talem enim persecutionem Christianis intulerat, qualis non fuerat audita a tempore paganorum. Quam ob rem predictus archiepiscopus sapienti usus consilio, vi ab urbe compulsi exire.] Frotmundus vero, frater eius, et ceteri milites de civitate ingressi in turrin quae est in civitate, obtinuerunt eam. Rex autem oppugnans eam diebus multis, cepit eam et fratrem Rainardi comitis Frotmundum duxit in carcerem Aurelianis civitate; ubi et defunctus est.' Col. 864.

(1075-1143).<sup>24</sup> It is not important for our purpose to determine which writer copied from the other.

To anyone familiar with the *Loherain* cycle, the activities of the Rainard-Fromont family in the chronicles have an unmistakably familiar ring:—their being considered renegades and attackers of the Christian religion,<sup>25</sup> their arbitrary blocking of appointments to vacant posts,<sup>26</sup> their defying of royal and ecclesiastical authority;<sup>27</sup> the fact that some members of the family were in holy orders,<sup>28</sup> finally, the insistent references of the chroniclers to members of this old family such as Fromont as being 'natus ex mala radice,'<sup>29</sup> or 'vetulus Rainaldus'<sup>30</sup> as dying 'post multa perpetrata mala.'<sup>31</sup>

If we juxtapose with the above facts the career of the Bordelais clan in the *Loherain* poem, we find the following: Fromont renounced Christianity and led an army of Saracens from Spain against Christian France;<sup>32</sup> the initial quarrel between the Loherains and the Bordelais arose over the disposition by the king of a fief which had suddenly become vacant;<sup>33</sup> both Bernart de Naisil, uncle of Fromont, and Fromondin, son of Fromont, were at one time in holy orders;<sup>34</sup> very frequent pejorative references are made in the poem to the treacherous and evil background of Fromont and his family.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Ordericus Vitalis *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* in Migne, *op. cit.*, vol. CLXXXVIII, col. 513.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. notes 18, 22, 23 above.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. notes 13, 14.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. note 21.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. notes 9, 13, 14, 21, 22.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. note 20.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. notes 12, 14, 21.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. note 20.

<sup>32</sup> *Ansej's*, p. 19; also *Girbert de Mes*, Paris: ms. N, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 3143, folio 115r.

<sup>33</sup> *Ansej's*, pp. 17, 18. In general, throughout the geste the Bordelais display an attitude of open defiance toward the king. At one point, for example, Fromont invades the royal palace with an armed force, attempting to assault the king while the latter is being waited upon at table by the Loherains. (cf. *Girbert*, *op. cit.*, 93v.)

<sup>34</sup> *Ansej's*, p. 20; E. DuMéril, *La Mort de Garin le Lorrain* (Paris: Franck, 1846), pp. 153, 163.

<sup>35</sup> e.g. Queen Blanchefleur taunts Fromont with being 'du lignage Garlain, Le traïteur qui meurtri son parain,' *Girbert*, *op. cit.* 106v; another of the Bordelais, Isoré li gris, a relative of Fromont, is reproached as follows: 'no wonder you are a traitor, in view of your ancestry' ('Bien

We thus have a three-fold connection—a name, a personality, a pattern of action—the very stuff of which poets, especially those who composed the French *chansons de geste*, were wont to weave their many-colored fabrics. Is it not therefore possible that this family, which played so important a rôle locally as to invite the interference of the King of France and excommunication by contemporary archbishops, may have left so strong an impression on posterity that the name Fromont suggested itself as an obvious choice for a powerful and scheming traitor when the *chansons de geste* came to be composed some hundred or hundred and fifty years later?<sup>36</sup>

If so, why should Fromont have been transported from his native Sens to Flanders and Artois, where we find him in the *Loherain* cycle?

In the first place, there is considerable resemblance between *s* and *l* as they are written in most mediaeval manuscripts, and that may have had something to do with Fromont de Sens becoming Fromont de Lens when the poet was dealing with the latter region. Secondly, there is a somewhat more direct connection between Sens and the city of Metz, which may be called the central city of the *Loherain* cycle.

In 775 Charlemagne had placed under Angelram, Bishop of le dois faire; de tel gent es naquis'), *Garin le Loherain*, ed. P. Paris, Paris: Techener, 1833, I, 171; or again,

'Sire Fromons, ce dist Garins li fiers,  
Bien avez fait quant m'avez acointié  
De traïson, ne vous puis blastengier:  
Garlain vostre aive ne volez forlignier  
Qui son parrain murdrit en un mostier,  
A son signor-lige coupa le chief  
Et son cousin fit en un sac noier.'

*Ibid.*, I, 130.

In the *Anseïjs*, Pépin, complaining of Fromont's family, says 'trop ai en eus trové de faussetez.' *Anseïjs*, line 3744.

<sup>36</sup> The fact that parts of the cycle have been, rightly or wrongly, ascribed to Jean de Flagy, a Champenois (cf. P. Paris, *op. cit.* I, xix), that Sens and the Sénonais formed part of the old province of Champagne (cf. P. Joanne, *Dict. géog. et admin. de la France*, Paris, 1905, VII, 4602), that a linguistic study has revealed many Champenois characteristics (*Anseïjs*, pp. 63, 67, 68 par. 21 and 23) would seem to lend some support to this hypothesis. M. Charles Bruneau in a letter which I received from him, dated April 24, 1940, remarks of the *Anseïjs*: 'certains traits me font songer à la Champagne.'

Metz, the 'régale de l'abbaye de Sénones, qui de monastère royal devint ainsi abbaye épiscopale et vint augmenter le domaine temporel de l'évêché.'<sup>37</sup> The bishops of Metz extended their power, acquiring civil and criminal jurisdiction toward the end of the ninth century.<sup>37</sup> This may account for the shifting of the exploits of Fromont and his family to Metz and the *Loherain* cycle.

As for the chief opponent of Fromont II, i. e. Leodoric—ought we to infer any connection between him and a priest of the same name in the *Garin*, who for a moment assumes a fairly important rôle in that poem, i. e. the Abbé Liétris, a member of the Loherain family, who adopts an intransigent attitude when Begon, brother of Garin, is killed in Fromont's forest?<sup>38</sup>

If it should be granted that the deeds of this Sénonais family are really connected with *Garin le Loherain*, one might now place its origin at a much earlier date than F. Lot was willing to assign to it,<sup>39</sup> even as early as the beginning of the eleventh century. This was the date given by French critics of the early nineteenth century, such as Paulin Paris, Edeléstand DuMéril, and Leroux de Lincy, who based their reasoning purely on archaeological data.<sup>40</sup> It also corresponds very closely with the dates I suggested in my edition of *Anseÿs de Mes*, on the basis of certain historical events which I there pointed out.<sup>41</sup>

HERMAN J. GREEN

New York City

---

<sup>37</sup> L. Schaudel, *Les Comtes de Salm et l'abbaye de Senones aux 12<sup>e</sup> et 13<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Nancy-Strasbourg-Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1921), p. 10.

<sup>38</sup> P. Paris, *op. cit.*, II, 249 ff. This character in the poem is referred to as Liederich by F. Mone, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Teutschen Heldensaga* (Leipzig: Basse, 1835), p. 235. He gives as Latin variants of this name: Leudericus and Liedricus; *ibid.*, 235 n. 1.

<sup>39</sup> I. e. end of the 12th century; cf. Lot, *op. cit.*, pp. 215, 216.

<sup>40</sup> P. Paris, *op. cit.*, I, xviii; E. DuMéril, *op. cit.*, xxxiii, xlv. Leroux de Lincy, *Analyse critique et littéraire du roman de Garin le Loherain* (Paris: Techener, 1835), p. 87.

<sup>41</sup> *Anseÿs*, p. 61.

## SUR DEUX LETTRES DE BAUDELAIRE

Une lettre, non datée, adressée à Mme Sabatier, commençant par les mots: "Très chère amie, C'est jouer de malheur . . .," a été insérée par les compilateurs de *Charles Baudelaire, Lettres (1841-1866)* entre le 31 août et le 8 septembre 1857. Et M. Y.-G. Le Dantec lui a conservé cette place dans son édition de la *Correspondance*.<sup>1</sup>

Trois détails de cette lettre prouvent cependant que l'année 1857 est hors de question:

1° Baudelaire prie Mme Sabatier de dire à Christophe "qu'il faut absolument qu'il vienne demain, lundi soir, dîner chez moi à l'Hôtel de Dieppe." Or, nous savons qu'en 1857 Baudelaire logeait à l'Hôtel Voltaire, 19 quai Voltaire, et qu'il loua une chambre à l'hôtel de Dieppe, 22 rue d'Amsterdam, seulement lors de son retour de Honfleur, au plus tôt vers le commencement de juillet 1859, et qu'il y demeura jusqu'au 15 décembre 1860, moment où il s'installa à Neuilly, 4, rue Louis-Philippe.<sup>2</sup>

2° Baudelaire apprend une nouvelle à sa correspondante: "Saviez-vous," dit-il, "que l'infortunée señora Martinez roulait dans les cafés lyriques et qu'elle chantait, il y a quelques jours, à l'Alcazar?" D'un article paru dans *Le Ménestrel* du 29 avril 1860, il ressort qu'à cette date l'Alcazar, situé 10 rue du Faubourg-Poissonnière, avait été fondé depuis peu de temps par Joseph Meyer.<sup>3</sup>

3° Vers la fin de la lettre, Baudelaire raconte à Mme Sabatier qu'il avait "tout récemment" refusé "une charmante invitation de Wagner." C'est le vendredi 17 février 1860 que Baudelaire écrivit au musicien allemand pour lui exprimer son admiration. En

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres complètes*, III, 186-7.

<sup>2</sup> Le 29 juin 1859, Baudelaire n'avait pas encore choisi son domicile, puisqu'il demande à sa mère d'adresser les lettres à la *Revue française (Dernières Lettres inédites, p. 112)*. En fait, la première lettre où il donne l'Hôtel de Dieppe comme adresse est datée du 27 septembre (*Correspondance*, éd. Le Dantec, p. 276).—Le 8 décembre 1860, il écrit à sa mère: "Je crois que je pourrai m'installer vers le 15 (Neuilly, rue Louis-Philippe, numéro 4)." (*Lettres inédites*, p. 209). Le 1er janvier, il écrit de nouveau: "Je suis installé ici (4, rue Louis-Philippe, Neuilly) depuis une quinzaine de jours." (*Ibid.* 210).—Il devait retourner à l'Hôtel de Dieppe vers la fin de 1861. (Cf. Lettre à M. Pelletier du 30 décembre 1861.)

<sup>3</sup> L'auteur de l'article souhaitait bonne chance à la nouvelle entreprise.

réponse à cet hommage Wagner invita Baudelaire à venir le voir. Et une lettre du 28 février, adressée à Champfleury, nous apprend que c'est ce jour-là que Baudelaire répondit pour remettre à plus tard la visite attendue : "J'écris immédiatement à M. Wagner pour le remercier de tout mon cœur. J'irai le voir, mais pas tout de suite. Des affaires assez tristes me prennent tout mon temps. Si vous le voyez avant moi, dites-lui que ce sera pour moi un grand honneur de serrer la main d'un homme de génie, insulté par toute la populace des esprits frivoles." <sup>4</sup>

Tous ces faits concordent : la lettre appartient à l'année 1860 et elle est postérieure au 28 février.

Une autre lettre à Mme Sabatier, celle-là datée du 4 mars 1860, va nous permettre de préciser. Les deux lettres sont en effet inséparables, car elles se raccordent en plusieurs points.

Dans la lettre non datée, s'excusant de ne pas être allé chez Mme Sabatier, le dimanche précédent, Baudelaire donne comme une des raisons de son absence qu'il avait "une peur épouvantable d'être obligé de parler à Feydeau de son dernier roman."—Dans la lettre datée, il annonce que la "grande difficulté est levée" : il a "rencontré Feydeau, qui n'a pas lâché une si belle occasion d'entendre parler et de parler de lui."

Dans la lettre non datée, Baudelaire annonce à Mme Sabatier qu'il voulait lui apporter un album, qu'il l'avait fait mettre de côté pour elle, mais il a "préféré tarder un peu et demander d'autres épreuves."—Dans la lettre datée, promettant à sa correspondante d'aller la voir la semaine suivante, Baudelaire ajoute : "J'aurai sans doute l'album." <sup>5</sup>

Enfin, dans la lettre non datée, Baudelaire dit sur un ton badin à Mme Sabatier : "Si vous supposiez que je ne pense jamais à vous, vous vous tromperiez beaucoup,—et je vous le dirais plus souvent, si vous n'aviez pas adopté pour moi de si vilains yeux."—Dans la lettre datée, il déclare : "Je suis bien aise que vous ayez remarqué la phrase sur vos yeux. Le fait est qu'ils sont fort laids (quand ils le veulent)."

Les deux lettres évidemment se suivent, la lettre non datée précédant l'autre.

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondance*, éd. Le Dantec, p. 306.

<sup>5</sup> Il s'agissait d'un album de gravures par Méryon, pour qui Baudelaire, à ce moment-là, professait une grande admiration (cf. lettres à Poulet-Malassis des 8 janvier et 16 février 1860). Il parle aussi de cet album à sa mère dans une lettre du 4 mars 1860 (*Dernières lettres inédites*, p. 132).

Or, cette lettre non datée fut écrite un dimanche: "Je ne vous ai pas répondu hier," dit en commençant Baudelaire, "alors que je me croyais sûr de venir ce soir chez vous, et, aujourd'hui, comme tant d'autres dimanches, il m'arrive des ennuis qui font que je vais m'enfermer comme une bête féroce." Nous avons vu, d'autre part, qu'il invitait Christophe pour "demain, lundi soir." Mais le 4 mars, en 1860, tombait un dimanche. Entre le 28 février, date limite établie plus haut, qui était un mardi, et le 4 mars, il n'y a pas de place pour un autre dimanche. Les deux lettres ont donc été écrites le même jour, 4 mars 1860.

On peut reconstituer la suite des événements pendant cette journée. Le samedi 3, Mme Sabatier a écrit à Baudelaire pour le presser de venir enfin chez elle à la réunion hebdomadaire du lendemain. Baudelaire ne répond pas tout d'abord. Avait-il, comme il l'a affirmé, l'intention de se rendre rue Frochot? C'est fort douteux, car les ennuis qu'il invoque il les avait déjà mentionnés dans sa lettre à Champfleury plusieurs jours auparavant, et c'est seulement le dimanche, au saut du lit, qu'il s'aperçoit qu'il lui "arrive des ennuis!" Par commissionnaire, sans doute, il envoie une lettre à Mme Sabatier pour se dégager. Mme Sabatier réplique sur le champ, pour insister. Elle a évidemment manifesté des doutes sur la sincérité des raisons alléguées par Baudelaire, puisque celui-ci croit nécessaire de se défendre: "Si je vous dis que j'ai des chagrins énormes, que jamais je n'ai connu pareil orage, que j'ai besoin de solitude, vous ne me croirez pas. Mais, si je vous dis que j'ai le nez rond, gros, et rouge comme une pomme, et que, dans ces cas-là, je ne vais même pas voir les hommes (à plus forte raison les femmes), je suis sûr que vous me croirez." D'où la seconde lettre confirmant l'impossibilité de se rendre chez Mme Sabatier, ce dimanche comme les autres.

L'extraordinaire activité épistolaire des deux correspondants est suggestive. Elle nous laisse entrevoir sur quel pied se poursuivaient, en ce printemps de 1860, les relations de Baudelaire avec la Présidente. Celle-ci n'a pas rompu après la fameuse lettre du 31 août 1857, dans laquelle l'amant de quelques heures, désappointé, l'avait précipitée à bas de son piédestal de "Muse et de Madone." Ceci nous le savions, de même que nous connaissions les efforts de Baudelaire, par la suite, pour éviter de trop fréquentes, et sans doute gênantes, apparitions dans le salon de la rue Frochot. Mais ce dont on ne se doutait pas c'est l'insistance que mettait encore, en 1860, la

maîtresse de maison à attirer chez elle son ancien admirateur. On a supposé que Mme Sabatier, après sa déconvenue, avait, en femme sensée, accepté que l'amour impossible se transformât en une calme et solide amitié. La métamorphose ne s'accomplit pas—si elle s'accomplit jamais—aussi sagement. Entre les lignes des deux lettres du 4 mars on devine toute une manœuvre, non exempte d'impatience, pour reprendre l'impertinent qui envoyait excuse sur excuse et demeurait insaisissable. Baudelaire avait beau multiplier les amabilités, prêter des livres, faire des cadeaux, promettre des albums, comptant que ces petites attentions le dispenseraient de plus intimes prévenances, Mme Sabatier, apparemment, ne désarmait pas. L'offre de "camaraderie" sur laquelle Baudelaire avait insisté, un peu cruellement, dans sa lettre du 2 mai 1858, ne pouvait pas, il faut en convenir, consoler une femme dont l'amour-propre avait été profondément blessé. Les "vilains yeux," auxquels il est fait allusion dans les lettres, nous permettent de supposer que la gracieuse amitié à laquelle Mme Sabatier paraissait se résigner, dissimulait pas mal de dépit et de fureur refoulés. Nous avons là un autre "duellum," sur lequel le poète aurait pu écrire un sonnet moins dramatique que celui qu'il a consacré à Jeanne Duval. Mais Baudelaire ne possédait pas la veine comique.<sup>6</sup>

\* \* \*

"L'infortunée señora Martinez," mentionnée par Baudelaire, était une cantatrice de couleur, connue sous le nom de la "Malibran noire" et qui, pendant une dizaine d'années, de 1850 à 1860, connut le succès à Paris.

Maria del Loreto Martinez, née en 1820 à La Havane, de parents nègres d'origine africaine, se fit remarquer, dès son enfance, par la beauté de sa voix. Le gouverneur espagnol de l'île, Don Francisco Aguilar, la prit chez lui, l'éleva avec ses propres filles et lui fit donner des leçons de musique. Lorsqu'il rentra en Espagne, il emmena la jeune négresse à Séville. Là, Maria Martinez put se familiariser avec les airs et les danses des gitanes et étudier la vieille musique espagnole. Ayant épousé un officier cubain, Don

<sup>6</sup> Baudelaire s'est contenté d'écrire *Semper eadem*. Ce poème forme un curieux post-scriptum à la lettre du 31 août 1857. En termes polis l'ami dit à la Présidente qu'elle est incapable de comprendre les sentiments d'un homme qui s'est enivré d'un mensonge. Ce sonnet parut le 15 mai 1860, deux mois environ après l'envoi des deux lettres dont il est question dans le présent article.

Mariano Moreno, elle retourna à La Havane. Mais son mari ayant été impliqué dans une affaire de corruption, elle dut quitter une seconde fois son pays natal. Elle se rendit à Madrid, où on la trouve en 1848, suivant des cours au Conservatoire de cette ville. Son talent la signala à l'attention de la reine Isabelle qui lui octroya une pension et l'attacha à sa maison.

Ayant amassé quelque argent, la Malibran noire partit pour Paris, en 1850. Son titre de pensionnaire de la reine d'Espagne, surtout la beauté de sa voix, lui ouvrirent les salons parisiens de M. de Thorigny, du comte de Saint-Germain, du vicomte d'Arlincourt, d'Eugénie Garcia &c. On organisa pour elle des concerts à la Salle Hertz, au Théâtre italien, à la Salle Pleyel. Elle fut pendant quelque temps attachée au Théâtre des Variétés. Elle fit aussi une apparition à Londres en 1850, et figura dans un intermède inséré dans *I Puritani* de Bellini, joués au Théâtre de Sa Majesté.<sup>7</sup>

Elle se spécialisait dans les mélodies espagnoles et chantait en s'accompagnant de la guitare. Un critique de la *Revue et Gazette musicale de Paris* a décrit, comme suit, le talent de la Malibran noire: "Sa voix un peu altérée en ce moment par suite du changement de climat a plus d'expression que d'éclat; mais si le volume n'en est pas très fort, en revanche, elle se prête à la volubilité des mouvements les plus rapides, à la variété des accents joyeux ou douloureux, moqueurs ou mélancoliques. Ce n'est pas tout d'entendre la cantatrice, il faut la voir: elle est à la fois musique et spectacle."<sup>8</sup>

Bien qu'elle fût noire comme de l'ébène, la señora Martinez était, paraît-il, fort belle et de manières suprêmement élégantes. Un journaliste enthousiaste la compara à une Vénus florentine en bronze. Un autre rédacteur de la *Revue et Gazette musicale* a dit: "C'est quelque chose d'insolite, de bizarre, d'original, de mélancolique et de gai qui vous transporte en pensée dans un harem de l'Orient."<sup>9</sup>

Cette dernière phrase suggère le genre d'intérêt que Baudelaire dut concevoir pour la señora Martinez et dont la lettre non datée

<sup>7</sup> La señora Martinez était introduite dans le sérail d'un Sultan, dont elle devait chasser l'ennui (idée qui dut plaire à Baudelaire s'il en eut connaissance). Un rédacteur de *The Illustrated London News* affirme qu'elle fit sensation dans ce rôle.

<sup>8</sup> N° du 9 juin 1850, p. 194.

<sup>9</sup> N° du 16 juin 1850, p. 198.

nous apporte le témoignage. Il l'avait sans doute entendue dans les salles de concert où elle s'était produite. Il se trouvait probablement chez Mme Sabatier le dimanche soir où Théophile Gautier l'amena chanter dans le salon de la rue Frochot.<sup>10</sup> Il faut assurément joindre la "Malibran noire" au groupe des femmes—Mme Autard de Bragard, Dorothée la Malabaraise, la négresse évoquée dans *Le Cygne*;<sup>11</sup>—qui ont composé une escorte exotique à Jeanne Duval dans l'imagination de Baudelaire.

ALBERT FEUILLERAT

Yale University

# A PROPOS DE "NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE EN FRANCE"

Les admirateurs américains de *La Brière*, connaissant l'enracinement plus que barrésien de son auteur Alphonse de Chateaubriant, n'iraient peut-être pas d'emblée chercher, chez cet écrivain, des traces de l'intérêt porté par la France à Nathaniel Hawthorne. Un des ouvrages récents du romancier, *La Réponse du Seigneur* (1933), porte cependant témoignage d'une influence imprévue que son quasi-homonyme le grand vicomte saluerait sans doute avec joie.

A travers la triple fiction, un peu compliquée, d'un récit jadis raconté par un mystérieux protagoniste à un premier témoin qui,

<sup>10</sup> P. Dufay, *Autour de Baudelaire*, p. 230.

<sup>11</sup> Peut-être Baudelaire songeait-il à la señora Martinez (de race africaine, je l'ai déjà dit) quand il s'est apitoyé dans *Le Cygne* (publié le 22 janvier 1860) sur

la négresse, amaigrie et phtisique,  
Piétinant dans la boue, et cherchant, l'œil hagard,  
Les cocotiers absents de la superbe Afrique.

Vers la fin de 1859, Maria Martinez était si endettée que l'on saisit tous ses effets. Une ordonnance du tribunal lui restitua sa guitare, comme "instrument de travail." Ceci explique qu'elle ait dû accepter des engagements dans les cafés lyriques, ainsi que l'a rapporté Baudelaire.

Les renseignements biographiques qui précèdent ont été pris dans D. Baltazar Saldoni, *Diccionario biográfico-bibliográfico de Efemérides de músicos españoles*, tomo IV, Madrid, 1881; *Revue et gazette musicale de Paris*, 9, 16 juin 1850, 4 janvier, 12 avril 1852, 1, 29 mai 1853, 12 juin, 25 décembre 1859, 5 février 1860; *L'Illustration*, 22 juin 1850; *La Ilustración española y americana*, vol. 49, 30 mars-8 avril 1905; *The Illustrated London News*, vol. 17, 20 juillet 1850.

vieillard, en fait à son tour la relation au narrateur, des vues se font jour qui, parentes de celles de Ballanche, de Nodier, de Balzac sur la "palingénésie," incluent *The Great Stone Image* parmi leurs arguments. C'est même, au gré de Marcel Arland, "le plus haut point du livre" (*NRF*, 1er septembre 1933). Citons l'essentiel de l'anecdote qui va devenir symbolique :

C'était dans un petit village perdu de la montagne, perdu au pied d'un immense rocher qui le dominait de sa masse granitique, et dans lequel avait été sculptée par la nature une gigantesque figure humaine. . . .

On disait qu'un jour, un homme d'une bonté merveilleuse, et ressemblant trait pour trait à la figure de la montagne, viendrait dans l'humble hameau exercer sa vertu et y répandre d'inoubliables bienfaits. . . .

Or un certain petit garçon qui comme tout le monde avait appris la miraculeuse prédiction, en avait reçu dans son cœur une impression si vive, qu'il ne cessait d'y réfléchir et de tenir ses yeux levés vers la grande figure immobile . . . Et de plus en plus il chérissait la grande figure de pierre; en même temps que, sans en avoir conscience, il lui ressemblait graduellement.

Et cela dura nombre d'années, le nombre d'années qu'il fallut pour qu'il atteignît l'âge d'homme. . . . Jusqu'à un certain jour qu'il s'en alla par la place de village, et que ses amis et voisins, levant leurs yeux, eurent une émotion indicible, en se rendant compte que celui dont l'antique tradition prédisait la venue était au milieu d'eux. (Pages 171 ss.)

Or rien ne marque mieux, semble-t-il, l'interprétation faite, par la mystique contemplative du Français, de l'idéalisme social de l'Américain que ce récit lui-même et que l'ardent commentaire qui en sera fait quelques pages plus loin: mais tout "comparatiste" sait combien fécondes sont, dans l'histoire des idées, de telles "réfractions." Hawthorne attribue à son héros Ernest, pour la réalisation du mimétisme décisif de la fin, une vie active et variée: il se met en quête de la ressemblance promise en la cherchant parmi toutes sortes de professions, et "the bustle and dim of cities" ne saurait être exclus d'une telle recherche. Ici,—d'accord avec une mystique assez différente et qui se sert (comme jadis les *palingénésistes* de la chrysalide) du papillon devenu semblable à la feuille, et du chevalier du Graal modelé sur son idéal tenacement contemplé,—l'action cède le pas à la ferveur immobile :

Mais alors, qu'a-t-il fait, le petit héros de Nathaniel Hawthorne?

—Il a prié.

—Il a prié! mais vous m'avez dit seulement, monsieur, qu'il avait regardé pendant toute son enfance la figure de la montagne? En quoi a-t-il prié, faisant cela?

—C'est la même, chose: prier c'est contempler, et contempler, c'est devenir.

—Contempler c'est devenir! . . . Et ainsi ce chevalier est devenu? . . . Il était de la boue. . . . Il est devenu du soleil?

—Exactement. . . . Prier, c'est entrer dans un autre univers!

Et, plus loin encore:

. . . ce petit papillon a fait exactement devant la feuille, ce qu'a fait devant le génie de la montagne le petit héros de Nathaniel Hawthorne.

—Comment cela, monsieur?

—Qu'ils sont devenus l'un et l'autre semblables à ce qu'ils regardaient.

Cette explication me laissa tout songeur. Car, à la réflexion, . . . en effet . . . peut-être . . . cela pouvait s'être passé de la façon qu'il disait: Ce papillon était devenu semblable à ce qu'il avait regardé, tout comme le petit héros de la montagne. . . .

Ainsi s'est précisé le double symbole: "sans vision le peuple périt." Ses modes d'application, dirons-nous, différent chez l'écrivain français et chez son prédécesseur américain: mais n'est-ce point dans ces variations que réside la force des mythes? S'il est permis de me citer au sujet de la "grande image de pierre," je me rappelle qu'en 1913-14, achevant mon cours de Harvard sur "le type de l'honnête homme au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle," je citai l'anecdote de Hawthorne pour rappeler quelle émulation animait Méré et ses zélés, et que M. Bliss Perry me remercia d'avoir ainsi rattaché l'un à l'autre deux épisodes de l'histoire de la civilisation, liés en effet par la notion d'un mimétisme social progressif.

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

*The University of California at Los Angeles*

#### SIR JOHN PASTON'S GRETE BOOKE, A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY "BEST-SELLER."

One of the most interesting items in that collection of documents now known as the *Paston Letters* is the bill rendered by William Ebesham for certain books which he had written and illuminated for Sir John Paston. Among the books so listed is one entitled the *Grete Booke*, the contents of which are given in the bill as:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> James Gairdner, *The Paston Letters*, London and Exeter, 1904, v, 3-4. From internal evidence, it is clear that the bill must have been written after 1468, probably in the following year.

First, for wrytyng of the Coronacion, and other tretys of Knyghthode, in that quaire which conteyneth a xiiij. levis and more, ij <sup>d</sup> a lef.....	ijs.	ijd.
Item, for the tretys of Werre in iiij. books, which conteyneth lx. levis aftir ij <sup>d</sup> a leaff.....	xs.	
Item, for <i>Othea</i> pistill, which conteyneth xliij. leves.....	vijs.	ijd.
Item, for the Chalengs, and the Acts of Armes which is xxviiij <sup>th</sup> lefs .....	iijs.	viijd.
Item, for <i>De Regimine Principum</i> , which conteyneth xlv <sup>th</sup> leves, aftir a peny a leef, which is right wele worth.....	iijs.	ixd.
Item, for Rubricsheng of all the booke.....	iijs.	iiijd.

This is presumably the same book named in the inventory of John Paston's books under the note: <sup>2</sup>

Memorandum, my Boke of Knyghthod and the man[er] off makyng off Knyghts, off Justs, off Tor[neaments], ffyghtyng in lystys, paces holden by so[lidiers] . . . and chalenges, statuts off weer and *de Regim[ine Principum]*, valet . . .

As early as 1819, the catalogue of the Lansdowne manuscripts <sup>3</sup> described no. 285 as "A volume, the greatest part of which formerly belonged to Sir John Paston, Knight, in the reign of Edw. IV. and was copied for him by one William Ebesham, a Scribe by profession." From that day on and as recently as 1939, the identification of the Lansdowne manuscript as the Paston *Grete Booke* has been frequently made. <sup>4</sup>

It has been consistently overlooked, however, that the editor of the *Paston Letters* himself inclined, as early as 1889, to a different belief. Gairdner <sup>5</sup> admitted that the *Grete Booke* "certainly bore

<sup>2</sup> Gairdner, *op. cit.*, VI, 66. It is not certain whether the inventory refers to John Paston the younger or to John Paston, Knight, but it must be dated *post* 1475 as a copy of Caxton's edition of the *Game and Play of the Chess*, printed in Bruges not before 1475, is also listed there.

<sup>3</sup> *A Catalogue of the Lansdowne Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London, 1819, p. 99. A few years earlier, Francis Douce also referred to 'a volume once belonging to Sir John Paston, Knight, in the reign of Edward the fourth, and now in the Lansdowne collection of MSS. in the British Museum.' ('On the peaceable Justs, or Tiltings of the middle ages,' *Archaeologia*, XVII (1814), 290-96).

<sup>4</sup> Sir George Warner, *The Epistle of Othea to Hector*, London, The Roxburghe Club, 1904, p. x, n. 4; H. S. Bennett, *The Pastons and their England*, Cambridge, 1922, p. 113; James W. Thompson, *The Medieval Library*, Chicago, 1939, p. 409.

<sup>5</sup> James Gairdner, *Sailing Directions for the Circumnavigation of England*, London, Hakluyt Society, 1889, p. 6 ff.

a wonderful resemblance to the Lansdowne volume" but the fact remained that *Lansdowne MS. 285* did not correspond exactly with Ebesham's description nor did it contain all the tracts enumerated in the bill. The editor summarized his opinion as: "There is, however, another theory which, I am inclined to think, will account more satisfactorily for these discrepancies. A professional transcriber, no doubt, copied and recopied the same treatises often for various customers, and though the contents are very much the same there is nothing positively to show that the Lansdowne volume was Sir John Paston's copy of the 'Grete Booke' at all."

That the Paston *Grete Booke* was no special work but merely a copy of a common fifteenth-century "Sammelband" is proved by manuscript 775 of The Pierpont Morgan Library. Though the Morgan manuscript is well-known and has been frequently described, its similarity both to the *Grete Booke* and to *Lansdowne MS. 285* has never been adequately pointed out.<sup>6</sup> The manuscript<sup>7</sup> contains the following tracts:

1. Justus of the Pees, ff. 3r-4v [*Lansdowne MS. 5-7*].<sup>8</sup>
2. Table for measuring expenses, ff. 5r-11v.
3. Assize of bread and ale, ff. 12r-13v.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Compare Harold Arthur, Viscount Dillon, 'On a Manuscript Collection of Ordinances of Chivalry of the Fifteenth Century belonging to Lord Hastings,' *Archaeologia*, LVII (1900), 29-70. Lord Dillon incorrectly stated that items 2, 3 and 13 listed below were also included in *Lansdowne MS. 285*. He further claimed that the Morgan MS. was copied from the Paston *Grete Booke*; on this, see note 29 below.

<sup>7</sup> Compare: Albert Way, 'Illustrations of Mediaeval Manners and Costume from Original Documents,' *Archaeological Journal*, IV (1847), 226-39; Dillon, *op. cit.*; *Astley Sale Catalogue*, London, Sotheby, 1931, lot 7; *The Pierpont Morgan Library. Exhibition of Illuminated Manuscripts held at The New York Public Library*, New York, 1934, pp. 47-48; *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, New York, 1935-37, II, 1501-2. A number of mistakes in the *Census* and in the other works are here corrected.

<sup>8</sup> References to the Lansdowne manuscript are by the numbers assigned to the tracts in the catalogue. This tract was printed by Lord Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare also *MS. Harley 69*, fol. 20, and the French text in *MS. Douce 271*, fol. 32. The text of the Lansdowne MS. was printed by Douce, *op. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare also the text in *The Customs of London, otherwise called Arnold's Chronicle*, London, 1811, p. 49 ff.

4. Poem on the Coronation of Henry VI (1429), ff. 14<sup>r</sup>-15<sup>v</sup> and 24<sup>r</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 2].<sup>10</sup>
5. The manner and form of the Coronation of Kings and Queens, ff. 16<sup>r</sup>-23<sup>r</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 1].<sup>11</sup>
6. De Re Militari, in English, ff. 25<sup>r</sup>-121<sup>v</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 47].<sup>12</sup>
7. How a man schall be armyd at his ese, ff. 122<sup>v</sup>-123<sup>v</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 4].<sup>13</sup>
8. Epistle of Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, to Richard II on tournaments, ff. 124<sup>r</sup>-130<sup>r</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 8].<sup>14</sup>
9. Sailing directions, ff. 131<sup>r</sup>-138<sup>v</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 48].<sup>15</sup>
10. Secreta Secretorum, in English (imperfect), ff. 139<sup>r</sup>-195<sup>r</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 54].<sup>16</sup>
11. How knyghtes of the Bath schuld be made, ff. 195<sup>v</sup>-198<sup>v</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 3].<sup>17</sup>
12. To make aqua composyta (later hand), f. 199<sup>r</sup>.
13. Epistle of Othea to Hector, in English (imperfect), ff. 200<sup>r</sup>-274<sup>v</sup>.<sup>18</sup>
14. Recipe for making powder (later hand), f. 275<sup>r</sup>.
15. Challenges of Pierre de Masse, ff. 275<sup>v</sup>-276<sup>v</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 10].<sup>19</sup>
16. Challenges of Philip Boyle, ff. 277<sup>v</sup>-279<sup>r</sup> [Lansdowne MS. 9].<sup>20</sup>
17. Oath of a herald, ff. 279<sup>v</sup>-280<sup>r</sup>.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare also the MSS.: *Harley* 6149, fol. 115<sup>v</sup>; *Cotton Nero C IX*, fol. 165; *Addit.* 6113, fol. 10; *Ashmole* 865, fol. 245.

<sup>12</sup> Edition by Miss K. Garvin announced by the Early English Text Society.

<sup>13</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.*, from this manuscript, and from the Lansdowne manuscript by Douce, *op. cit.* Compare C. J. Foulkes, *The Armourer and his Craft*, London, 1912, pp. xix and 107.

<sup>14</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare MSS.: *Ashmole* 856, ff. 83-93 and 383-391 and *Harley* 69, fol. 26. See also W. H. Black, *Illustrations of Ancient State and Chivalry*, London, Roxburghe Club, 1840, pp. 121-38.

<sup>15</sup> Printed by Gairdner, *op. cit.*, from the Lansdowne MS.

<sup>16</sup> Printed by Robert Steele, E. E. T. S., E. S. LXVI. *Morgan MS.* 775 was not known to Steele or to Carleton Brown, *A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse*, Oxford, 1916-20, no. 582.

<sup>17</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.* Compare MS. *Cotton Nero C IX*, fol. 168<sup>v</sup> and the French text in *Douce* 271, fol. 35. See also William Dugdale, *The Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London, 1656, p. 531 ff.; Alfred Byles, *Caxton's Ordre of Chyualry*, E. E. T. S., O. S. 168, pp. 127-31.

<sup>18</sup> Printed by Sir George Warner for the Roxburghe Club, London, 1904, from the Longleat MS. The *Morgan MS.* was not listed by Warner or Brown, *op. cit.*, no. 1703. See also note 26 below.

<sup>19</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.*; compare Dugdale, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

<sup>20</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.*; compare Dugdale, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

<sup>21</sup> Printed by Dillon, *op. cit.*; compare MS. *Douce* 271, ff. 14, 22 and 60.

18. Weather prognostications, ff. 280<sup>v</sup>-282<sup>v</sup>.
19. Calendar in Latin, ff. 283<sup>r</sup>-288<sup>v</sup>.
20. Astrological diagrams, ff. 289<sup>v</sup>-290<sup>v</sup>.
21. Parvus and Magnus Cato, in Latin and English, ff. 293<sup>r</sup>-320<sup>r</sup>.<sup>22</sup>
22. Four things that make a Man a Fool, by Lydgate, f. 320<sup>r</sup>.<sup>23</sup>
23. Stanza on Deceit, by Lydgate, f. 320<sup>r</sup>.<sup>24</sup>
24. Medical recipes (later hand), f. 320<sup>v</sup>.

The Morgan manuscript, then, also bears a wonderfully close resemblance both to the Lansdowne volume and to Paston's *Grete Booke*,<sup>25</sup> though the number of leaves occupied by the important tracts common to the three manuscripts differs in each case:

<sup>22</sup> Printed by Max Förster, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, cxv (1905), 298-323, and cxvi (1906), 27-42. Prof. Förster kindly informs me that the text in the Morgan MS., which he did not use for his edition, belongs to his group  $\beta$  and that, though this is an inferior class of manuscript, the Morgan text is one of the better ones within this group. *Morgan MS.* 775 was not listed by Brown, *op. cit.*, nos. 533 and 2533.

<sup>23</sup> This stanza was printed by H. N. MacCracken, *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, E. E. T. S., O. S. 192, II, 709, though the Morgan MS. was not known to him. It is also not listed by Brown, *op. cit.*, no. 2693.

<sup>24</sup> A single stanza from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, Book II, lines 4432-38 (ed. by Henry Bergen, E. E. T. S., E. S. cxx-cxxiv). Not listed by Brown, *op. cit.*, no. 438.

<sup>25</sup> Gairdner, *op. cit.*, states: 'But it is singular, to say the least, that the order in which they stand in the [Lansdowne] MS. is different from that of the account. Moreover, the "tretys of Werre," in four books, covers not sixty leaves, but only fifty-three, and a quarter of a page more. Also the treatise *De Regimine Principum* occupies, not forty-five leaves, but only forty-four; and further, there is nothing in the volume corresponding to "Othea pistill." . . . If, therefore, this MS. be the "Grete Book," referred to by Ebesham in his account, it is certain that he cited the contents in a wrong order, made two slips as to the number of leaves each article occupied, and entered one charge for a treatise not in the book at all among those which really do belong to it. Such an amount of error is scarcely conceivable in a bill so methodically drawn up, even though the writer was, as he himself says, at the time driven to live in sanctuary to escape his creditors.' The Lansdowne Catalogue furthermore claimed that certain tracts were in the handwriting of Sir John Paston; as to this, Gairdner remarks that there is no handwriting in the volume 'which bears the least resemblance either to that of the Sir John Paston who died in Edward IV's time, or to that of his brother John, who was knighted after him, in the days of Henry VII.'

	Grete Booke	Lansdowne MS.	Morgan MS.
<i>De Re Militari</i>	60	53	97
<i>Epistle of Othea</i>	43	— <sup>26</sup>	75+
<i>De Regimine Principum</i> <sup>27</sup>	45	44	57+
[ <i>Secreta Secretorum</i> ]			

It thus seems likely that Gairdner's assumption that numerous copies of the Paston *Grete Booke* were made is correct, and consequently it does *not* necessarily follow that the Lansdowne volume <sup>28</sup> is the same as that owned by Sir John Paston. The "standard" volume, from which all three manuscripts were probably derived,<sup>29</sup> apparently contained the three longer articles noted

<sup>26</sup> As the Paston inventory notes under item 11 'a Boke de Othea,' it is possible either that the Pastons owned two copies of the *Othea* or that this work had been separated from the *Grete Booke*. If the latter be true, then the lack of the *Othea* in the Lansdowne MS. is of no significance in proving that this manuscript was not the Paston *Grete Booke*. *Longleat MS.* 253 of this text contains 75 leaves and *St. John's Cambridge MS.* 208 comprises 61 folios; furthermore, both these manuscripts are incomplete. It is likely therefore that none of the extant MSS. of the *Othea* was the one written by William Ebesham for Sir John Paston. The present writer is preparing a new edition of this work.

<sup>27</sup> If the Lansdowne MS. is not identical with the *Grete Booke*, there is nothing to show that the Paston volume did not actually contain the Hoccleve text rather than the Lydgate-Burgh translation of the *Secreta Secretorum*. It is generally assumed that the inventory is incorrect here because the Lansdowne MS. contains the Pseudo-Aristotelian tract.

<sup>28</sup> The Morgan MS. may be even closer to the Lansdowne volume than the present summary indicates. In one instance certainly, the binder has misbound the sheets, for the quire containing the Coronation Ceremony is inserted into the middle of the poem on the Coronation of Henry VI. It is not unlikely that certain other tracts (particularly item 7) are now not in the position originally intended, but conclusive proof for this is not forthcoming. Nevertheless it is not impossible that some of the tracts were intended to be bound in the same order as they now stand in the Lansdowne MS. but the unusual quiring in the Morgan MS. (some quires contain only a single sheet) makes it impossible to ascertain in what order the various tracts were meant to stand.

<sup>29</sup> Lord Dillon offers a different solution. He says (*op. cit.*, pp. 31-2): 'Both MSS. [Lansdowne and Morgan] were doubtless copied from some original, now not known, but called in Sir John Paston's accounts, where the copying is noted and paid for, "The Grete boke."' This seems most improbable, as the Morgan and Lansdowne manuscripts are contemporary in point of date, with the *Grete Booke*. The *Grete Booke*, in turn, remained in the hands of the Paston family at least till 1475 and perhaps much

above as well as a number of shorter tracts suitable for the quiet enjoyment of a knight; to this, special items were added to suit the tastes of the individual purchaser. Perhaps it may not be too rash, therefore, to suggest that these manuscripts represent an early instance of "mass-production." The books were obviously written for the landed gentry and the success which this "edition" appears to have enjoyed seems to entitle it to the distinction of being "a fifteenth-century best-seller."

CURT F. BÜHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library*

#### ASTROLOGICAL PROGNOSTICATIONS IN MS. 775 OF THE PIERPONT MORGAN LIBRARY

Among the texts illustrating medieval folk-lore, astrological prognostications are perhaps among the most interesting. Numerous texts of this sort, in Old English as well as in various other tongues were printed some years ago by Professor Max Förster<sup>1</sup> and to these may now be added the prognostications which appear in Morgan MS. 775.<sup>2</sup> The text in the Morgan MS. comprises a thunder-book, a prognostication based on the day of the week on which the moon changes and a general discussion of the influence of each planet.

The first of these is clearly the most interesting. Prof. Förster divided the Old English thunder-books or *βροντολόγια* into five groups, based on the time when thunder was first heard:

longer, so that it is most unlikely that copies could have been made from it before that date. Furthermore, these two MSS. have tracts in common which do not appear to have been included in the *Grete Booke*.

<sup>1</sup> *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, CX, 346-58; CXX, 43-52 and 296-305; CXXVIII, 285-91, with important notes. See also R. H. Robbins, "English almanacks of the fifteenth century," *Philological Quarterly*, XVIII, 321-31, and Prof. Förster's comment, *ibid.*, XIX, 411-2. For further notes on the Morgan MS. see my paper "Sir John Paston's *Grete Booke*, a fifteenth-century 'best seller,'" pp. 345-51 above.

<sup>2</sup> These texts were not noted by Seymour de Ricci in his description of the manuscript in the *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (1935-37), II, 1501-2.

- (1) According to the month
- (2) According to the day of the week
- (3) According to the hour of the day or night
- (4) According to the canonical hour
- (5) According to the position in the heavens

A zodiacal thunder-book, to which group the Morgan text belongs, was not printed by Prof. Förster though he referred to a Slavic one in the course of his discussion. It is probable that the source for the present text may be found in the *Summa astrologiae iudicialis* by Joannes Eschuid, or, to give his name in the English form, John of Eschenden.<sup>3</sup> Here the text reads:<sup>4</sup>

Dicit itaque hermes trimegistus libro quarto, capitulo 3. et leopoldus in libro suo tractatu sexto.<sup>5</sup> quod in quocunque signo tonuerit siue in die siue in nocte. unum erit quicquid notauerit anno eodem nisi alter tonitruus in secundo signo ab eo uenerit et tunc prioris non peribunt. Si in ariete tonuerit herbae habundabunt: angustia erit in filiis hominum quadrupedia multiplicabuntur. Sed bestiae agri minorabuntur. Si in tauro tonuerit annonae montium prosperabuntur et in uallibus deficiet uinum et bestiae agri multiplicabuntur.<sup>6</sup> Si in geminis pluuiarum et grandinum copia erit et fulmina legumina habundabunt lanigerarum paucae et reptilia multa.<sup>7</sup> Si in canero erit fames hominum et commotio: locustae quoque fructus terrae uastabunt. Si in leone seditio erit inter regna: annona cara in principio in fine et erit populi seditio et morietur aliquis magnus homo in fine anni. Si in uirgine ferae bestiae hominibus insidiabuntur quadrupedia morientur. Si in libra siccitas erit in ualle in principio anni: deinde descendunt pluuiarum et erit annona cara in fine anni.<sup>8</sup> Si in scorpiione racemi erunt

<sup>3</sup> Compare Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, vol. III, chap. XXI, New York, 1934.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted from the copy in The Pierpont Morgan Library (PML 20700), Venice, 1489, folio 145 verso.

<sup>5</sup> I have not been able to locate the passage in the works of Hermes Trimegistus, though a similar passage does occur in Leupoldus, *Compilatio de astrorum scientia*, "Tractatus sextus de mutatione aeris." Through the courtesy of the librarian of the College of Physicians in Philadelphia, I have been able to consult a photostatic copy of the edition printed by Erhard Ratdolt in Augsburg, 9 January 1489. As Leupoldus' text occasionally differs, his readings have in several instances been quoted in the footnotes.

<sup>6</sup> In [Tauro] annona bona in montibus: pauca in uallibus: uinum et bestiae agri multiplicabuntur. Leupoldus.

<sup>7</sup> In [Geminis] pluuiarum erunt multae et grandines: frumentum et legumen multum: aues paucae: reptilia multa. Leupoldus.

<sup>8</sup> In [Libra] siccitas in principio: in fine anni pluuiarum: et annona cara in fine. Leupoldus.

pauci: oleum uile: pisces *et* pecudes morientur foemine abortiuos faciunt. uenti magni erunt clima ab oriente obfuscabitur.<sup>9</sup> Si in sagitario pluuiæ erunt congruæ: fructus arborum cadent: serui regum praeliabuntur. Si in capricorno multæ gentes dispergentur magna pestis erit in filiis hominum *et* mortalitas undique. Si in aquario pluuiæ magnæ erunt etiam terror in hominibus uentus infrigidet: tussis *et* scabies *et* commotio magna erit in saeculo. Et si in piscibus tonuerit erit gelu *et* siccitas in terra *et* fructus terræ deficient. uinum tantum habundabit. diuitiæ erunt in populo: *et* homines infirmabuntur nec tamen morientur.<sup>10</sup>

The remaining astrological predictions are not very unusual and suitable comparisons may be made with any number of medieval treatises on astrology. A number of footnotes have been added, however, to indicate possible sources or parallels and to show where the English text is at fault.

The text printed below is found on folios 280 verso to 282 verso of Morgan MS. 775. The handwriting is of the late fifteenth century and, though carefully written, there are several omissions and slips of the pen, as may be seen by comparing the English and Latin texts.

Whenne it thundreth in Ariete that is to say whenne the Sonne is in Ariete there shall be moche gras moche desese to mon-kynde shall come fowre foted beestes shullen multiplie

Whenne it thundreth in Tauro all thyng that newed in hulles shull been ese And thynges in valeys shullen faylle And wyn feld beestus shull multiplie

Whenne it thundreth in Geminis thenne there shall be moche rayne And hayll whete shall multiplie and mony wormes that crepenne shullen be

Whenne it thundreth in Cancro thenne shall be moche hungre And botur-fleus shull distroye fruytus

Whenne it thundreth in Leone there shall be grete desese betwene kyn[g]-domes And dere corne in the begynnyng or in the last ende shall be desese of peple And A grete man shall deye

Whenne it thundreth in Virgine thenne it signifyeth that Weluus [sic] shullen doo desese to men And foure fotede beestes shullen deye

Whenne it thundreth in Libra thenne there shall be drowth in the valeyes and in the ende of the yere shall be moche reyne And cornes shall be full dere in the ende &c

Whenne it thundreth [in] Scorpione thenne there shall be lytyll Oyll and ffysshes of the See shullen deye and beestes Wommen shall haue many dede

<sup>9</sup> In [Scorpione] racemi pauci pisces *et* pecudes morientur femine abortient: venti erunt magni: [Luna] in oriente obscurabitur. Leupoldus.

<sup>10</sup> In [Piscibus] gelu *et* siccitas in terra: fructus terre deficient: vinum multum abundabit: diuitie erunt: homines infirmabuntur: non tamen multi morientur. Leupoldus.

- (1) According to the month
- (2) According to the day of the week
- (3) According to the hour of the day or night
- (4) According to the canonical hour
- (5) According to the position in the heavens

A zodiacal thunder-book, to which group the Morgan text belongs, was not printed by Prof. Förster though he referred to a Slavic one in the course of his discussion. It is probable that the source for the present text may be found in the *Summa astrologiae iudicialis* by Joannes Eschuid, or, to give his name in the English form, John of Eschenden.<sup>3</sup> Here the text reads:<sup>4</sup>

Dicit itaque hermes trimegistus libro quarto, capitulo 3. *et leopoldus in libro suo tractatu sexto.*<sup>5</sup> *quod in quocunque signo tonuerit siue in die siue in nocte. unum erit quicquid notauerit anno eodem nisi alter tonitruus in secundo signo ab eo uenerit et tunc prioris non peribunt. Si in ariete tonuerit herbae habundabunt: angustia erit in filiis hominum quadrupedia multiplicabuntur. Sed bestiae agri minorabuntur. Si in tauro tonuerit annonae montium prosperabuntur et in uallibus deficiet uinum et bestiae agri multiplicabuntur.*<sup>6</sup> *Si in geminis pluuiarum et grandinum copia erit et fulmina legumina habundabunt lanigeræ paucae et reptilia multa.*<sup>7</sup> *Si in canero erit fames hominum et commotio: locuste quoque fructus terrae uastabunt. Si in leone seditio erit inter regna: annona cara in principio in fine et erit populi seditio et morietur aliquis magnus homo in fine anni. Si in uirgine ferae bestiae hominibus insidiabuntur quadrupedia morientur. Si in libra siccitas erit in ualle in principio anni: deinde descendunt pluuiæ et erit annona cara in fine anni.*<sup>8</sup> *Si in scorpiione racemi erunt*

<sup>3</sup> Compare Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, vol. III, chap. XXI, New York, 1934.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted from the copy in The Pierpont Morgan Library (PML 20700), Venice, 1489, folio 145 verso.

<sup>5</sup> I have not been able to locate the passage in the works of Hermes Trimegistus, though a similar passage does occur in Leupoldus, *Compilatio de astrorum scientia*, "Tractatus sextus de mutatione aeris." Through the courtesy of the librarian of the College of Physicians in Philadelphia, I have been able to consult a photostatic copy of the edition printed by Erhard Ratdolt in Augsburg, 9 January 1489. As Leupoldus' text occasionally differs, his readings have in several instances been quoted in the footnotes.

<sup>6</sup> In [Tauro] *annona bona in montibus: pauca in uallibus: uinum et bestie agri multiplicabuntur.* Leupoldus.

<sup>7</sup> In [Geminis] *pluie erunt multe et grandines: frumentum et legumen multum: aues pauce: reptilia multa.* Leupoldus.

<sup>8</sup> In [Libra] *siccitas in principio: in fine anni pluie: et annona cara in fine.* Leupoldus.

pauci: oleum uile: pisces *et* pecudes morientur foemine abortiuos faciunt. uenti magni erunt clima ab oriente obfuscabitur.<sup>9</sup> Si in sagietario pluuiæ erunt congruæ: fructus arborum cadent: serui regum praeliabuntur. Si in capricorno multæ gentes dispergentur magna pestis erit in filiis hominum *et* mortalitas undique. Si in aquario pluuiæ magnæ erunt etiam terror in hominibus uentus infrigidet: tussis *et* scabies *et* commotio magna erit in saeculo. Et si in piscibus tonuerit erit gelu *et* siccitas in terra *et* fructus terræ deficient. uinum tantum habundabit. diuitiæ erunt in populo: *et* homines infirmabuntur nec tamen morientur.<sup>10</sup>

The remaining astrological predictions are not very unusual and suitable comparisons may be made with any number of medieval treatises on astrology. A number of footnotes have been added, however, to indicate possible sources or parallels and to show where the English text is at fault.

The text printed below is found on folios 280 verso to 282 verso of Morgan MS. 775. The handwriting is of the late fifteenth century and, though carefully written, there are several omissions and slips of the pen, as may be seen by comparing the English and Latin texts.

Whenne it thundreth in Ariete that is to say whenne the Sonne is in Ariete there shall be moche gras moche desese to mon-kynde shall come fowre foted beestes shullen multiplie

Whenne it thundreth in Tauro all thyng that newed in hulles shull been ese And thynges in valeys shullen faylle And wyn feld beestus shull multiplie

Whenne it thundreth in Geminis thenne there shall be moche rayne And hayll whete shall multiplie and mony wormes that crepenne shullen be

Whenne it thundreth in Cancro thenne shall be moche hungre And boturfleus shull distroye fruytus

Whenne it thundreth in Leone there shall be grete desese betwene kyn[g]-domes And dere corne in the begynnyng or in the last ende shall be desese of peple And A grete man shall deye

Whenne it thundreth in Virgine thenne it signyfeth that Weluus [sic] shullen doo desese to men And foure fotede beestes shullen deye

Whenne it thundreth in Libra thenne there shall be drowth in the valeyes and in the ende of the yere shall be moche reyne And cornes shall be full dere in the ende &c

Whenne it thundreth [in] Scorpione thenne there shall be lytyll Oyll and ffysshes of the See shullen deye and beestes Wommen shall haue many dede

<sup>9</sup> In [Scorpione] racemi pauci pisces *et* pecudes morientur femine abortient: venti erunt magni: [Luna] in oriente obscurabitur. Leupoldus.

<sup>10</sup> In [Piscibus] gelu *et* siccitas in terra: fructus terre deficient: vinum multum abundabit: diuitie erunt: homines infirmabuntur: non tamen multi morientur. Leupoldus.

chi[l]dren within here body there shullen be grete wyndes there shall be a merkenes in the Mone in the Est parte of the firmament

Whenne it thundreth in Capricornu thenne shall moche peple be disperged and grete pestilence in children of men And grete pestylence [in] all the world

Whenne it thundreth in Sagittari thenne reynes shullen be but euene fruytus of treus shullen falle and kynges shullen zeuenne batayllus

Whenne it thundreth in Aquario thenne shullen be grete raynes and grete drede of peple the wynd shall engendur the couz and the scabbe and grete stryfe shall be in the world

Whenne it thundreth in Pissibus thenne shall be grete forstes and dryenes in the eyre ffrutus on erth shull fayll wyne shall multiplie moche rychesse shall be amonge the peple many A man shall be seke but they shull not deye

In what signe þat euyr it thundreth whether it by day or be nyght as it is notified it shall be soth but so be that it thundyr in þe next signe aftur thenne the thunder of the furst leseth his strenght And the seconde thunder holdeth his strength and it farith in eche signe

If the mone chaunge on Soneday hit signifieth drye wether fro the furst day tyll the xxx<sup>th</sup> day

If it chaunge on Monday it signifieth weþer drye ne wete

If it chaunge on the Tywysday it signifieth cold weþer And northen wynde

If it chaunge on the Wendysday it signifieth wete wethurs

If it chaunge on the Thurday [*sic*] it signifieth bryzt weþer and clere

If it chaunge on þe ffryday hit signifieth medlyd weþer drye and rayne

If he chaunge on the Seturday hit signifieth rayne weþer

This rewel faylleth not moche if it be well taken in his chaunge tr[e]wlyche <sup>11</sup>

Ye shullen vnderstande there be planettes

Saturnus Jubiter Mars Sol Venus Mercurius Luna

The planet of Saturne is cold and drye and shrewed And whenne he regneth he maketh all maner of Tempast he maketh A man hevy and gelowe of complexions And mony other thynges <sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> A similar prognostication may be found in *Batman vppon Bartholome, His Booke, De Proprietatibus Rerum* (London, 1582) in the chapter entitled "De Neomenia," folio 150 recto. Here it reads: "Also of the Prime the common rule is, that Sunday Prime is dry weather, Munday prime wet, Teusday prime, cold and windie, Wednesdays tempestuous, Thursday faire and cleere, Friday changeable, Saterday rainie, the three dayes from the chaunge, is the prime day." See also the early English version in MS. Cotton Tiberius A III, f. 38v.

<sup>12</sup> Bartholomaeus Anglicus says that Saturn has "two dedely qualytees. coldnesse & drynesse." He also says that Saturn "makyth a man broun & fowle, mysdoynge, slowe & heuy, eleyng & sorry, seldom gladde & mery

Jubiter he is hote and moyst and he is good to all thynges And he doth none harme to man he maketh A man good and honest and of wyn colour and he bryngeth all clere wethur and all goodnus

Mars is cold and drye and shrewed he maketh a man croked and wrathfull and malicious And whanne he regneth he signifieth batel and falshed<sup>13</sup>

Sol that is the Sonne he is hoot and drye and temporat he maketh erbes and trews to growe and bere fry3t he maketh A man to be full of flessch and fayr and manerly of other th[il]nges

Venus that is day-sterre he is hote and moyst and Sangwyn he maketh A man to be whyte colour redy glad and lecherus he loveth all goodnus<sup>14</sup>

Mercurius [*sic*] he is cold and drye his vertue is with good he is good with euel he maketh A man wyse and many other dyuerse goodnesse he cordeth with all the planettes<sup>15</sup>

Luna he [*is*] cold and moyst for why by the Mone we haue encrese and decrease he maketh A man to be mevable neuer to dwell in oon place he maketh a man to haue his on hande ay more thenne his other his on fote more thenne his other or any other lymme

Of these planettes there is a table<sup>16</sup> to knowe euery day whanne any of hem regneth And thus I suppose that this day be called Thursday that is to say Jubiter atte the Sonne rysyng that same planet that day is cold aftur reigne [*sic*] And next aftur hym next houre regneth Mars And the next houre aftur hym regneth Sol And aftur hym regneth Venus And aftur hym the next houre regneth Marcurie And aftur hym the next that is the sixte oure regneth Luna And aftur hym the next oure regneth Saturnus And aftur hym regneth Jubiter And so eueryche oure tyl pou come to 24 oures euery planet regneth aftur odor

CURT F. BÜHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library*

other laughyng. And therfore Pholomeus [*sic*] sayth they þat ben subgette to Saturnus haue oft euyl drye chynnes in the hynder party of the fote. And ben yelow of colour & broun of heere & sharpe in al the body and vnsemely." *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, Westminster, Wynkyn de Worde, 1495, Lib. VIII, cap. xij.

<sup>13</sup> "Mars est planeta calidus et siccus." Albohazen Haly, *Liber in iudiciis astrorum*, Venice, Ratdolt, 1485, f. 4r.

<sup>14</sup> "Venus est frigida et humida," Albohazen Haly, *op. cit.*, f. 5. "Venus est frigida humida et temperata," Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum naturale*, Strassburg, R-Printer, 1473, Lib. XVI, cap. xlv.

<sup>15</sup> "Mercurius est calidus et siccus," Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*

<sup>16</sup> A manuscript table of this sort in French is written on the title-page of the copy of Leupoldus in the library of the College of Physicians in Philadelphia. It is drawn up for every day of the week. A table drawn up only for Sunday may be found in Albumasar, *Introductorium in astronomiam*, Augsburg, Ratdolt, 1489, signature g4 verso.

## HYGD

Queen Hygd, the wife of King Hygelac of the Geatas, is thrice mentioned in *Beowulf*. Her name first appears in the description of the Geatish court which the poet gives in lines 1925 ff.:

- 1925 Bold was betlic, bregorof cyning,  
 hea, healle, Hygd swiðe geong,  
 wis, welþungen. þeah ðe wintra lyt  
 under burhlocan gebiden hæbbe,  
 Hæreþes dohtor, næs hio hnah swa þeah,  
 1930 ne to gneað gifa Geata leodum,  
 maþmgestreona: mod þryðo wæg,  
 fremu folces ewen, firen ondrysne.

'The building was grand, the king renowned, high, the hall even so, Hygd very young, wise, virtuous. Though she may have spent only a few years at court, the daughter of Hæreth, nevertheless she was not ungenerous, nor too sparing of gifts and treasure to the men of the Geatas: the good folk-queen had weighed the arrogance and terrible wickedness of Thryth.'

The passage offers certain difficulties of interpretation. I take *healle* 1926 to be a dative of accompaniment: king *with* hall means king *and* hall; each is said to be high.<sup>1</sup> Alternatively, *healle* may be taken with *bold*; such a dative construction seems strange to modern feeling, which would prefer a simple appositive, but it is not unknown in *Beowulf*.<sup>2</sup> The phrase *under burhlocan* need not be taken literally; like *in gearдум*, it may mean simply 'in the world' or 'on earth.' If so, the clause *þeah . . . hæbbe* means 'young though she may have been.' On the other hand, *under burhlocan* makes excellent sense if taken literally. We must then suppose that Hygd was not only young (1926b) but also inexperienced in court life and courtly ways. Whatever the interpretation of *under burhlocan*, the poet goes on to tell us that Hygd rose to the situation. Her treatment of the retainers was just what it should be, and the rightness of her conduct seems to be attributed to her wisdom, for the poet represents her as weighing the conduct of Thryth. He does not add in so many words that she rejected Thryth as a model of behavior, but the necessary implication is that she not only weighed Thryth but also found her wanting.

<sup>1</sup> The scansion of the half-line may be compared to that of 947a and the like; cf. J. Hoops, *Beowulfstudien* (Heidelberg, 1932), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> See my paper in *Anglia* LVII (1933), 313 ff.

More particularly, Hygd did not treat the retainers with the harshness characteristic of Thryth, but was kind to them.

The intellectual (or at least reflective) twist which the poet gives to Hygd's behavior was in all likelihood inspired by the queen's name, which means 'mind, thought, reflexion, forethought.' And it was the same inspiration which led him to contrast Hygd with Thryth, whose name means 'strength, might, power, force.'<sup>3</sup> The two ladies indeed stand at opposite poles, as the *Beowulf* poet presents them. The moderate, reasonable, reflective Hygd wins favor with all, while the reckless, impulsive, cruel Thryth brings down upon herself general condemnation, in spite of her beauty and magnetic personality. The presumably historical characters, the wife of Hygelac and the wife of Offa, hardly made such a contrast in real life. We have no means of knowing what they were actually like, but it is a safe presumption that their names contributed largely to the development of their characters and careers in story (as distinguished from history). This is not the place to investigate the tale of Thryth. The *Beowulf* poet's first reference to Hygd (considered above) gives us some idea of Hygelac's wife as a character in heroic story. We get further information about her later on. According to lines 2172 ff., Beowulf upon his return from Denmark gave to Hygd the collar which the Danish queen had given to him; he also gave three saddle-horses to Hygd. These gifts hardly have much significance for our present purpose; they represent a conventional or customary procedure, and it would be hazardous to read into them anything personal, even though the poet takes the trouble to tell us that Hygd wore the collar afterwards. The last passage in which Hygd is mentioned, however, adds something to our picture of her. Hygelac lost his life in the Low Countries, and Beowulf went back to the land of the Geatas as sole survivor of the ill-fated expedition. Upon his arrival, we are told,

<sup>3</sup> The contrary theory, according to which Hygd's name was an invention of the English poet, has little to commend it. The name-element *hugd* was actually used in Old Germanic name-giving; see M. Schönfeld, *Wb. der altgerm. Personen- und Völkernamen* (Heidelberg, 1911), p. 142, with the references there given, and see especially S. Gutenbrunner, *Die germ. Götternamen der antiken Inschriften* (Halle, 1936), p. 78. Moreover, Hygd's name alliterates with her father's. We have good reason, then, to think that Hygelac's wife was actually named Hygd.

- 2369 þær him Hygd gebead hord ond rice,  
 beagas ond bregostol; bearne ne truwoðe  
 þæt he wið ælfylcum eþelstolas  
 2372 healdan cuðe, ða wæs Hygelac dead.

Here the poet represents Hygd as having in her hands the bestowal of the Geatish throne. Such a state of things presupposes a woman of unchallenged authority, and such authority could hardly be hers simply as the widow of the king. Personal competence and a devoted following would seem to be necessary implications here. Moreover, Hygd lives up to her name when she offers the crown to Beowulf. Her reason for making him this offer is instructive. She considers her son Heardred incompetent to maintain the kingdom against attack from abroad. This calculating, coldblooded decision is worthy of the name *Hygd*. Beowulf is represented as refusing the offer, out of loyalty to Hygelac's memory; he consents only to serve as regent until Heardred has become older. Whether the offer of the kingdom was ever made, in point of fact, need not concern us. We are interested primarily in the character of Hygd, as developed by the poet, and the trait under discussion makes it manifest that the Geatish queen is consistently characterized in terms of her name.

KEMP MALONE

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

#### A RESTORED READING IN THE TOWNELEY PURIFICATION PLAY

Mr. George England in the Early English Text Society's edition of *The Towneley Plays* has claimed that the rubric on page 185, following line 132 of the Purification Play, is illegible in its final part. He properly reads the first portion, *Angeli cantant; simeon*. . . . Professor Frampton in his articles upon the shortcomings of the E. E. T. S. edition has allowed Mr. England's statement to stand uncontested;<sup>1</sup> and so far as I know, no reading has heretofore been proposed.

The words in question are admittedly indistinct; yet from a photostat of the manuscript I believe they are not absolutely

<sup>1</sup> Mendal G. Frampton, "The Early English Text Society Edition of the Towneley Plays," *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XLVIII, 330-333, 366-368; XLIX, 3-7.

illegible, and that the full rubric is to be read, *Angeli cantant: Simeon iustus & timoratus*. Of the final word the photostat shows an *at* plus a flourished *us* at the end, legible enough. The scribe's symbol for & is also evident, and his flourish for the final *us* of the word I take to be *iustus*. The long interior *s* and the top of the *t* which follows it seem also evident in this word. Before this long *s* three short heavy vertical strokes remain visible which might be read as *iu*, my reading, or *in*, or just possibly, *m*. In the word I read as *timoratus* the initial *t* is I think sufficiently legible, and probably the *i* which follows. The *mor* appears to be badly rubbed; yet there is nothing visible which does not coincide with the reading I propose. The long stroke below the line of the *r* is still clear. Incidentally, the *S* of Simeon is wrongly transcribed in the E. E. T. S. edition as minuscule. In the manuscript it is properly majuscule. This is the evidence from the photostat itself. The drawing shows what I find in it, as well what I believe to have been the original condition of the script. The first line gives what the photostat shows, the second my restoration of the so-called illegible portion.

Angeli cantant Simeon iust⁹ & timoratus  
iust⁹ & timoratus

Evidence corroborating my reading lies in the fact that *Simeon justus et timoratus* is the incipit of the first antiphon of Lauds for the Feast of the Purification in the Roman Breviary. This antiphon was also used in times prior to the date of the Towneley manuscript as its occurrences in the *Hereford Breviary*, II, 104, and the *Ordinale Exon.*, I, 212, clearly show.

The English texts of the cycle plays, moreover, often echo the Latin rubrics which they include. The case before us is but another instance of this custom, as line 133, "Thou, symeon, rightwys and trew," immediately following the rubric is a paraphrase of the Latin. The lines which follow it also paraphrase a portion of the

antiphon not included in the incipit. I append the full antiphon and, for comparison, the pertinent lines of the Towneley play.

*Antiphon:* Simeon justus et timoratus expectabat redemptionem Israel, et Spiritus Sanctus erat in eo.

*primus angelus.* Thou, symeon, rightwys and trew,  
Thou has desyred both old and new,  
To haue a sight of cryst ihesu  
As prophecy has told!

EDWARD MURRAY CLARK

University of Oklahoma

#### LILBURNE'S NOTE ON MILTON

Students of Milton's social ideas have long sought to clarify Milton's relationship with the leaders of the Leveller movement, Lilburne, Overton, and Walwyn. That Milton knew Overton appears probable from the close correlation between Milton's ideas of mortality as explained in *De Doctrina* and those of Overton's *Man's Mortallitie* (1644).<sup>1</sup> Milton was possibly Overton's collaborator in the 1655 edition of this pamphlet.<sup>2</sup> On March 26, 1649, Milton was ordered by the Council of State to "make some observations" on *England's New Chains Discovered* (Second Part),<sup>3</sup> which was the second Leveller denunciation of Cromwell and his officers as the new tyrants. On March 28, he was ordered to "make some observations on the complication of interests which is now amongst the several designers against the peace of the Commonwealth."<sup>4</sup> The "several designers" certainly included the Leveller leaders, of whom Cromwell had said, on March 26, "I tell you, Sir, you have no other way to deal with these men but to break them to pieces."<sup>5</sup> In spite of these two injunctions Milton wrote nothing against the Levellers; this circumstance alone is highly indicative either of his friendship for them as people or his conviction that Cromwell was unjust in sloughing off those extreme democratic segments of Commonwealth support upon which he had counted to help carry the Independents to power. It was left to John Canne to write

<sup>1</sup> Saurat, *Milton Man and Thinker*, pp. 312-20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 320-26.

<sup>3</sup> Masson, IV, 87.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 47.

the anti-Leveller blast, *The Discoverer*; and the authors of that skilful pamphlet, *Walwyns Wiles*, attempted to destroy Walwyn's reputation among the liberal churchmen of London, all supporters of the Independents. Though the official Commonwealth spokesman, Milton refused to use his talents against the radicals. In his tracts there is no mention either of the Leveller movement or of its leaders. The only direct reference to their tenets is in *Defensio Secunda*. Milton was no believer in manhood suffrage, a principal plank in the Leveller platform:

For who would vindicate your right of unrestrained suffrage, or of choosing what representatives you liked best . . . whoever they might be, or him, however small might be his worth, who would give you the most lavish feasts, or enable you to drink to the greatest excess? Thus not wisdom and authority, but turbulence and gluttony, would soon exalt the vilest miscreants from our taverns and our brothels . . . to the rank and dignity of senators.\*

About Milton the Levellers before 1652 were peculiarly silent. In Overton's tracts appears no mention of Milton that any one has yet discovered, nor in Walwyn's. Even in 1649, when the final break between Leveller and Independent resulted in the crushing of the Leveller movement, the Levellers gave no indication of their attitude toward the Commonwealth's literary champion. Lilburne at first thought *The Discoverer* might have been written by Gualter Frost, Milton's assistant. He later condemned the real author, John Canne, as an apostate. In reply to *Walwyns Wiles* Walwyn showed his utter disillusionment with John Price, former Leveller supporter, and his disappointment with John Goodwin, leading Independent pastor and friend of Milton's. But there is no mention of Milton himself, whose *Tenure* and *Eikonoklastes* had claimed for the new Commonwealth exemplification of the Levellers' democratic principles. The Levellers had every reason to

\* *Prose Works* (Bohn), I, 297. Milton's notion that wicked men would elect wicked men to office was in complete contrast to the position of Overton, who saw no relationship whatever between personal sinning and enlightened social action (*A Picture of the Council of State*, 1649, p. 44): "The business is, not how great a sinner I am, but how faithfull and reall to the Commonwealth; that's the matter that concerneth my neighbor . . . for my personal sins that are not of civill cognizance or wrong unto him . . . leave them to God, whose judgment is righteous and just."

attack the *Tenure* as pseudo-democratic doctrine which the Grandee Independents had no intention of putting into practice.

Lilburne's note on Milton in *As You Were* (1652), a passage which has hitherto escaped the notice of scholars, is particularly important, then, as the only evidence thus far uncovered that illuminates the Leveller attitude toward the increasingly famous Latin secretary. It is a surprisingly favorable appraisal of the last lines of Milton's *Defence*, which carry Milton's warning to the English people that the aims of the new Commonwealth yet remain largely unrealized:

Therefore as a man that intirely loves my native Countrey I shall request you to commend unto the serious and hearty consideration of the LORD GENERALL and his Confederates the Advice of their valiant and learned Champion Mr. MILTON, who haveing much spent his eloquence to rout the forces of SALMASIUS, in the Epilogue his Latin booke, „called a *Defense of the People of England*„ turns his speech to his Masters that had set him on worke, whom he with much *faithfullnes* and Freedome bespeakes on this manner. „One thing is remaineing and that haply of the greatest moment, that you o my Countrymen and Fellow-Cityzens should your owne selves undertake the refutation of this your adversary. . . . and that you shall in a short time find God more incensed with wrath against you, then ever yet your enemies have found him averse or you have felt him benigne, favourable and fatherly-affected unto you, more then to all the Nations at this time inhabiting the face of the whole earth. and soe far for Mr. *Miltons* excellent and faithfull advice to them.”

This passage shows Lilburne's high regard for Milton. He thinks of Milton as a courageous, frank critic of the Commonwealth, not an unquestioning adherent of the “Masters that had set him on worke.” He has read the *Defence* sympathetically, with respect for Milton's learning and eloquence. Whatever may be said of Lilburne's unreasonable combativeness, he was by common consent of his enemies an incorruptible patriot, undaunted by his most powerful enemies. Even though he knew that Milton was no democrat, Lilburne's praise was undoubtedly sincere. What may have affected Lilburne's attitude was Milton's uncompromising stand for toleration. Like Milton, the Levellers were more extreme tolerationists than the leading Independents; they had broken with Cromwell and Ireton on this issue in December, 1648, when the

\* *As You Were*, pp. 15-16. The extra commas that appear in the passage are Lilburne's insertions. Only a portion of the long Milton passage used by Lilburne is quoted here.

*Agreement of the People* was under discussion. Though Milton did not praise the Levellers, he knew them to be undaunted advocates of the religious freedom he held most dear. We are now certain that their regard for Milton had survived his support of their bitter enemies. From the pen of the most severe and uncompromising of the democratic critics, this praise of Milton is indication of a closer ideological and perhaps personal bond with the Levellers than scholars have hitherto assumed.

DON M. WOLFE

*Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute*

#### IZAACK WALTON A STATIONER?

Some new information indicates that during the Interregnum Izaak Walton may have operated a shop dealing in stationers' or booksellers' stores. If he did, the fact is interesting, for all of Walton's life is rather shadowy, no period more than this. Moreover, while various occupations have been ascribed to him,<sup>1</sup> that of a stationer has not heretofore been suggested. Unfortunately, whether it was he or some other Walton is yet impossible to say.

The new information is contained in the records of the Parliamentary Committee for Compounding with Delinquents, in the Public Record Office. According to an entry therein, on April 13, 1652, Dr. Nathaniel Holmes, lessee of a sequestered house of Bishop Henry King's, petitioned the Committee for help:

to maintaine my passage or doorway into the sayd house agaynst *Walton*, who dammeth it up in great part, with huge reames of brown paper, and paper bookes; giving out as I am informed that I shall not have way there, unlesse he please.<sup>2</sup>

Walton's first name is never given. The house in question—"Curlew House," "near the west end of Paul's"—had been settled by Bishop King on his second son, Henry. Sequestered once, it had been restored because the son was not a delinquent. On February 12, 1651/2, however, the Committee, deeming that it

<sup>1</sup> See Arthur M. Coon, "Izaak Walton's Residence and Occupation," *Notes and Queries*, 176, No. 7 (February 18, 1939), 110-12.

<sup>2</sup> Public Record Office, S. P. 23.89/1021.

should not have been restored, rented it for £18 to Dr. Holmes<sup>3</sup> (no doubt the Puritan divine and millenarian).<sup>4</sup> This was £10 below its normal rent, partly because the house had been standing empty and its walls had been broken down. Dr. Holmes specifically complained of "new quirkes from other houses let down into the yard, with breaking of casements and windowes to peeces."<sup>5</sup> But even £18 proved too high a rent for profit. On receipt of Dr. Holmes's petition, the Committee ordered Walton either to cease blocking the passage or to appear and explain.<sup>6</sup> Apparently he did neither, for three weeks later Dr. Holmes complained that, his former grievance not being redressed, William Legate had been emboldened by Walton to "open a door in the foreyard of the house, pretending that it is his."<sup>7</sup> Dr. Holmes now asked for examination of the titles of Legate and Walton, and the Committee summoned both offenders.<sup>8</sup> Thereafter Walton's name ceased to appear in the entries for a time, although he perhaps continued to collaborate with Legate. The latter, at least, persisted in his courses with such success that Dr. Holmes was unable to get a tenant for the rest of 1652. On January 7, 1652/3, Walton was again summoned on a renewed complaint of blocking the premises.<sup>9</sup> Finally, seven months later, Dr. Holmes apparently having been prevented by Legate and Walton from making any money on his bargain during the year and a half he was lessee, Curlew House was restored to the Kings, August 10, 1653.<sup>10</sup>

Izaak Walton, as we know, had given up his draper's business and moved from Chancery Lane in 1644; yet he remained in London at least ten years more.<sup>11</sup> What was he doing? Writing, we know. But that would not have sufficiently occupied the time and energy of so industrious a man as he seems to have been. Moreover, it would not have brought in much money. In fact he specifically mentions that he did not write the *Compleat Angler* for money.<sup>12</sup> Yet certainly his clerical friends of whom Anthony à Wood writes<sup>13</sup> were in no position to support him and his family

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.16/9.

<sup>4</sup> *DNB*, xxvii, 193.

<sup>5</sup> P. R. O., S. P. 23.89/1031.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 16/143.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 89/1029.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 89/1029.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 17/581.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 18/863.

<sup>11</sup> See Arthur M. Coon, *The Life of Izaak Walton*, unpublished Cornell University Ph. D. Thesis, 1938, pp. 124-25, 153 ff.

<sup>12</sup> In the "Epistle to the Reader," all editions.

<sup>13</sup> *Athenae Oxonienses*, 1691, i, 265.

in these years. Had he then laid by sufficient money for retirement by 1644? Or did he perhaps receive a large dowry when, in 1647, he married Anne Ken?<sup>14</sup> Possibly, yet he might well have engaged in some new business. That of a stationer, or seller of booksellers' or printers' supplies, would have required no special training, and he had many friends among booksellers and printers who could have helped him get into and continue in the business. As a matter of fact he held the lease on a house and shop in Paternoster Row, the heart of the booksellers' district, as early as 1662, and very likely earlier.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, Paternoster Row is the next street to St. Paul's Churchyard, and the square is a narrow one, so that the lessee of property on one street might conceivably block the doorway or passage of property on the other. Finally, Izaak Walton would very naturally have acted just this way toward any enemy of the Kings,<sup>16</sup> for he and Bishop Henry King were great friends. The best evidence of their friendship is a letter of 1664 from King which may glance at the very situation we have been discussing. It begins:

Honest Izaak:

Though a Familiarity of more than Forty years continuance, and the constant experience of your Love even in the worst of the late sad times, be sufficient to endear our Friendship. . . .

and concludes:

Your ever-faithful and affectionate old Friend,

Henry Chichester.<sup>17</sup>

It is curious, incidentally, that in 1638 the tenant next to William Legate in St. Paul's Churchyard (possibly the tenant of Curlew House) was Robert Roe<sup>18</sup>—curious, because Izaak Walton had a good friend named Robert Roe.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> He certainly received some dowry. See Coon, *Life of Walton*, p. 171.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 273-74. I say very likely earlier because he was not in London much after 1655.

<sup>16</sup> Though mild, he was not spineless; Charles Cotton says "he will be seen twice in no man's company he does not like, and likes none but such as he believes to be very honest men" (*Compleat Angler*, ed. Nicolas, 1875, p. 225).

<sup>17</sup> *The Compleat Walton*, ed. Keynes, 1929, pp. 209-12.

<sup>18</sup> Lambeth MS. 272, ed. T. C. Dale under title *The Inhabitants of London in 1638* (London, 1931), p. 66.

<sup>19</sup> The "Epistle to the Reader" of the *Compleat Angler* mentions the

There is, however, no certainty that this Walton was Izaak. It may well be objected, for instance, that there were other Waltons in London. An appraisement roll of 1638 mentions seven others.<sup>20</sup> But it is hard to dismiss as coincidences so many points of resemblance between the Walton of the doorway and Izaak Walton: especially the associations with printers, with property near Curlew House, with Robert Roe, and with the Kings. If this Walton was not Izaak, at least we have netted some close relative of his. As a matter of fact, we know of a Henry Walton who may have been a relative, and who might have been the Walton concerned in the Curlew House dispute. He was residuary legatee and sole executor of the will of Samuel Walton, of St. Mary's Cray, Kent (proved April 9, 1631), and is called a cousin of the deceased, "of Whitechapel, citizen and haberdasher."<sup>21</sup> These Waltons, too, were connected with the Kings, for Samuel Walton left bequests to his "brother-in-law, Henry King" [later, presumably, the Bishop], and to John King. Moreover, a Henry Walton—perhaps the same man, and very probably connected with Izaak—had a child of his baptised "Izaacke" at St. Martin's Church, Ironmonger Lane, October 17, 1619.<sup>22</sup>

Further research into the whole matter is needed, but that is of course impossible while the war continues. All we appear to be warranted in saying now is that Izaak Walton (or perhaps Henry Walton, a relative of whom little has heretofore been known) may have dealt in printers' stores about 1652.

ARTHUR M. COON

*Beloit College*

---

#### JOHN DONNE'S "BRACELET OF BRIGHT HAIR ABOUT THE BONE"

In his poems John Donne has twice used an expression so memorable that it has become associated with him—almost a symbol of his poetry. In one poem he speaks of "that subtile wreath of

happy times when Walton went fishing with "honest Nat. and R. Roe." Information in my possession indicates that the *R* stood for *Robert*.

<sup>20</sup> Dale, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>21</sup> *The Compleat Angler*, ed. Nicolas, 1875, p. clv.

<sup>22</sup> *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series, XII (November 15, 1873), 383.

haire, which crowns my arme"; in another one he uses the phrase "a bracelet of bright haire about the bone." Since Donne's poems were published in a loose grouping after his death, it is almost impossible to date the two poems, *The Funerall* and *The Relique*, in which these expressions occur. Dates are, however, of no particular importance, if the reader will accept the primary premise of this paper—that both the expressions are the product of a single obsession in the mind of Donne or of a single source outside it.

Here, I believe, is the raw material that Donne transformed in his alembic: Giraldus Cambrensis in his *Speculum Ecclesiae*<sup>1</sup> has described the search made for the bones of Arthur in the time of Henry II, the discovery of them, and their removal to the cathedral at Glastonbury. I offer here in translation only the pertinent lines. Within an oak coffin are discovered the heaped bones of Arthur and Guinevere. Tangled amongst the bones is "tricam muliebram flavam et formosam, miroque consortam" (a tress of woman's hair of a beautiful tawny hue, marvelously intertwined). In a briefer and later account in *De Principis Instructione*<sup>2</sup> Giraldus also mentions the exhumation, and there in different words he again refers to the lock of hair which was snatched up by a greedy monk and reduced to dust: "Trica comae muliebris flava cum integritate pristina et colore reperta fuit." (There was found a tress of woman's hair still fresh and fair in color and texture.)

The likeness between these accounts and the expressions in the poems is obvious. The manuscripts containing these accounts were in Robert Cotton's library,<sup>3</sup> to which Donne had apparently ready access. A letter written by Donne from the prison into which he was cast on his marriage to Ann More thanks Robert Cotton for the loan of a book,<sup>4</sup> and one written from Pyrford in 1603 to Cotton is evidently part of a linked correspondence.<sup>5</sup> It is simple enough, then, to prove that Donne had the chance to read the *Speculum Ecclesiae*; it is very difficult indeed to show that it was probable that he read it. I offer this as the most plausible sequence of events that led Donne to the passage.

Donne was more than a casual visitor to Cotton's library; he was

<sup>1</sup> *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Vol. IV (Rolls Series).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. VIII (Rolls Series).

<sup>3</sup> *Speculum Ecclesiae*, Cotton MS. Tiberius, BXIII; *De Principis Instructione*, Cotton MS. Julius, BXIII.

<sup>4</sup> Edmund Gosse, *Life and Letters of John Donne* (1899), I, 108.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 123-124.

an intimate of the circle that included Cotton. In 1615 Tom Coryat sent from Agra a letter "addressed to about twenty-five friends in England, members of 'the Right Worshipful Fraternity of Sirenical Gentlemen that meet the first Friday of every month, at the sign of the Mermaid in Broad Street in London.'"<sup>6</sup> Both Robert Cotton and John Donne are included in this company. If Donne moved in this company, he must have known William Camden, Cotton's antiquarian friend, who sought out Cotton to make use of his manuscripts for his study of the past. Camden had obviously consulted Giraldus Cambrensis and in his *Britannia* (1586) had sketched briefly the scene of the exhumation of Arthur, though, curiously enough, he had not included the bit about the hair. Now it is certainly more plausible to assume that the young Donne came to the obscure manuscript of Giraldus by way of the *Britannia* than through undirected search. The young Donne would have read a book deservedly popular in his day; his notoriously morbid imagination would have picked out the exhumation scene and carried it in his mind. It is not too rash to assume that a curious Donne later asked Camden for his source—and thus came on the material for his alchemy.

PHILLIPS D. CARLETON

University of Vermont

#### A MISDATING OF "A BALLADE UPON A WEDDING"

The *NED* in glossing "course-a-park" quotes, naturally enough, the lines from Sir John Suckling's well-known poem, "A Ballade Upon a Wedding": "At course-a-park, without all doubt, / He should have first been taken out"; but the quotation, instead of being attributed to Suckling, is given on the authority of the miscellany, *Wits Recreations*, and dated 1640. To trust the dictionary's dating would lead one to believe that Suckling's poem had first appeared in print during its author's lifetime instead of posthumously in the *Fragmenta Aurea* of 1646, as has always been supposed. One would also have to disbelieve the tradition that the poem was written in honor of the wedding of Lord Broghill and Lady Margaret Howard, which took place on January 27, 1641;<sup>1</sup> for the colophon of *Wits Recreations* (sig. Cc8<sup>v</sup>) dates the

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 275-276.

<sup>1</sup> See *The Dramatic Works Of Roger Boyle Earl Of Orrery*, ed. W. S. Clark (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), I, 11.

book October 8, 1639. Suckling's last scholarly editor, A. Hamilton Thompson, accepted the date of the poem as given by the *NED* and, unwilling to give up the tradition of the poem's celebrating the wedding, concluded the book was dated old style.<sup>2</sup> The colophon of course shows this to be impossible.

Had the maker of the slip for the dictionary or Mr. Thompson examined the 1640 edition of *Wits Recreations*, he would have searched in vain for Suckling's ballad. The book contains 503 numbered brief poems or epigrams and 126 numbered epitaphs, as well as "A Thousand outLandish Proverbs." by Mr. G. H., who is none other than George Herbert. The second edition of the book, dated 1641, adds some epigrams and epitaphs but omits the proverbs, printing in their place a section entitled, "Fancies And Fantastickes." In this section in the fourth edition (1650), which goes under the name *Recreation For Ingenious Head-peeces.*, "A Ballade" was printed,<sup>3</sup> but it was not attributed to Suckling. It was reprinted in the editions of 1654, 1663, and 1667. We must conclude therefore that to the *Fragmenta Aurea* of 1646 still belongs the honor of first printing Suckling's finest poem; and there is nothing in this date to disturb our belief that the poem celebrates the wedding of Lord Broghill and Lady Margaret.

The source of the misconception in the *NED* is instructive. In the second edition of Robert Nares' *Glossary* (1859),<sup>4</sup> the maker of the slip for the dictionary found the term "course-a-park" illustrated by stanza four of "A Ballade," which was attributed to *Witts [sic] Recreations*, but not to Suckling. Not recognizing it as Suckling's work, he looked up the date of the first edition of *Wits Recreations* and found it to be 1640; but he did not look at the book. The edition he used, as the bibliography of the *NED* reveals, was that of 1663, which is very different from that of 1640.

CARL NIEMEYER

Herzl Junior College  
Chicago, Illinois

<sup>2</sup> *The Works Of Sir John Suckling In Prose And Verse*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (1910), p. 370.

<sup>3</sup> Sigg. Z<sub>sv</sub> to Z<sub>sv</sub>. (I am indebted to Mr. James G. McManaway, who kindly looked up the poem for me in the Folger Library copy of the fourth edition.)

<sup>4</sup> I, 197.

# THE JONSONIAN TRADITION IN THE COMEDIES OF JOHN DENNIS

Ben Jonson claims the attention of scholars for various reasons, not the least of which, perhaps, is the fact that he popularized the comedy of humours. That this type of comedy persisted, with modifications, during the Restoration period has often been pointed out in connection with Thomas Shadwell, John Wilson, Abraham Cowley, Sir Robert Howard, William Cavendish, and other dramatists of the age. An examination of the comedies written by John Dennis provides another link in the chain of evidence connecting Jonson and the Restoration.<sup>1</sup>

In the preface (Advertisement to the Reader) to his first comedy, *A Plot and No Plot, or Jacobite Cruelty* (1697), Dennis points with pride to his observance of the unities, especially those of time and action.<sup>2</sup> One of the characters in the play mentions the realistic and satirical nature of the comedy.<sup>3</sup> Like Jonson, Dennis uses a pair of intriguers to direct the action,<sup>4</sup> and he presents "humour" characters similar in some respects to those of Jonson's comedies.<sup>5</sup> The plot of Dennis' play, too, generally resembles that of the

<sup>1</sup> H. G. Paul has noted Dennis' approval of Jonson's theories in *John Dennis: His Life and Criticism* (New York, 1911), pp. 170, 188-9; and E. N. Hooker, in *The Critical Works of John Dennis* (Baltimore, 1939), I, 495, has pointed out that, although Dennis was not blind to Jonson's faults, "Throughout his criticism Dennis praised Jonson as one of the best comic poets of the world." Neither of these two authorities, however, has shown that in actual practice Dennis continued the Jonsonian tradition.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, *Critical Works*, I, 245. Cf. Jonson's statement in the prologue to *Volpone*.

<sup>3</sup> "Belvil. . . is not this seen every day in the world? Are not more discerning people than my unkle drawn daily into the grossest snares upon the like occasions? The showing of which would therefore be just and instructive Satyr upon mankind in general." (*A Plot and No Plot*, I, i.) Cf. the prologue to *Every Man in His Humour*.

<sup>4</sup> The function of Belvil and Baldernoë is similar to that of the younger Knowell and Brainworm in *Every Man in His Humour*, or Clerimont and Dauphine Eugenie in *The Silent Woman*.

<sup>5</sup> The various disguises of Baldernoë recall those of Brainworm; Bull Sr., the "heavy father," is in the tradition of the elder Knowell (*Every Man in His Humour*); Bull Jr., the "would-be," resembles Fungoso (*Every Man out of His Humour*); and Macfleer, the braggart soldier, suggests Bobadill (*Every Man in His Humour*).

Jonsonian comedy of humours: the love affair of Belvil and Sylvia is distinctly subordinated to the exposure of folly,<sup>6</sup> and the action is a series of tricks by which Belvil and Baldernoe gull the two Bulls, father and son. Finally, as Bull Sr. himself points out, his situation is similar to that of Bartholomew Cokes, in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*;<sup>7</sup> his predicament also has a parallel in that of Morose, in *The Silent Woman*.<sup>8</sup>

Dennis' second comedy, *The Comical Gallant, or The Amours of Sir John Falstaff* (1702), is an adaptation of Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, a play which, as scholars have previously noted, bears some resemblance to the Jonsonian comedy of humours. But Dennis makes his alteration still more Jonsonian. In explaining his supposed improvements,<sup>9</sup> he points to his purpose of reform through exposing the follies of mankind, defines "humour" in a manner not inconsistent with that of Jonson, and tries to justify his subordination of the love element by saying that "Shakespeare had little Love in the very best of his Plays, and Jonson less in his, and yet this last was one of the best Comick poets that ever was in the world."<sup>10</sup> He omits certain scenes which he believes superfluous, notably those dealing with the quarrel of Shallow and Falstaff, and he further unifies the plot by making "everything instrumental to Fenton's marriage."<sup>11</sup> He makes Fenton the chief intriguer who controls the actions of a group of gulls.<sup>12</sup> Finally,

<sup>6</sup> Jonson's attention to the exposure of folly rather than to the love element has often been mentioned; see, for example, A. H. Thorndike, *English Comedy* (New York, 1929), pp. 589-90.

<sup>7</sup> "Bull Sr. I have been used like a Bartholomew Cokes." (*A Plot and No Plot*, v, i.)

<sup>8</sup> Both Bull Sr. and Morose have been gulled by fake marriages, both appeal for aid to the very persons responsible for their troubles, both receive aid after paying the price, and the remedy in both cases is the same—the revelation that there has been no marriage.

<sup>9</sup> See Frederick Kilbourne, *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare* (Boston, 1906), p. 45, and Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 349, for evidence that Dennis did *not* improve the work of Shakespeare.

<sup>10</sup> Hooker, *op. cit.*, I, 284-5.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 280.

<sup>12</sup> In Dennis' adaptation it is Fenton who persuades Falstaff that Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Page are in love with him, who bribes Nym and Pistol to betray Falstaff, who induces the Host of the Garter to bring about the quarrel of Dr. Caius and Sir Hugh, and who arranges for the meeting at

he points out that he has made certain changes in order to emphasize the humours of Falstaff and of Ford, the jealous husband.<sup>13</sup>

Dennis' third and last comedy, *Gibraltar, or The Spanish Adventure* (1705), is a play of the Spanish intrigue type and shows little resemblance to Jonson's comedy. However, it is significant that in the prologue the author continues to praise Jonson and that in his portrayal of Don Diego he emphasizes gulling in the Jonsonian manner.<sup>14</sup>

It is evident, then, that Dennis approved of Jonson's theories and that in two of his three comedies the Jonsonian tradition survived. As an isolated example, Dennis' acceptance of Jonson's principles would mean little; but the addition of his name to the already established list of dramatists who continued the tradition may shed further light upon Jonson's connection with Restoration comedy.

C. B. GRAHAM

Wright Junior College, Chicago

---

#### ROCHESTER'S "BUFFOON CONCEIT"

In his *Rochesteriana* (1926), Johannes Prinz printed as an "extempore," under the title of "Spoken to a Post-boy, 1674," an old manuscript entry in his own copy of *The Poetical Works of the Earls of Rochester, etc.*, 1739. It consists of six lines in which the peer asks the post-boy "the readiest way to Hell."

The complete poem of fourteen lines appears in a manuscript volume entitled "A Choyce Collection of Songs, etc.," recently acquired by the Ohio State University Library.<sup>1</sup> The title of this poem (which may quite possibly have been the original of Prinz' version) is "Earle of Rochester's Conference with a Post Boy, 1674." The first six lines differ only slightly from Prinz' version. The entire poem follows:

Herne's Oak. As an intriguer, therefore, he is far more important than in Shakespeare's play.

<sup>13</sup> "I have added to some of the parts in order to heighten the characters and make them show the better." (Hooker, *op. cit.*, I, 280.)

<sup>14</sup> *Gibraltar*, IV, i.

<sup>1</sup> A folio volume of 325 pages, in two late seventeenth-century hands. Many of the poems have appeared in print, notably in various editions of *Poems on State-Affairs*. Most of them are dated, but rather inaccurately.

Son of a Whore G—d damn thee, cans't thou Tell  
 A Peerless Peer the readiest Way to Hell?  
 I've Outswill'd Bacchus, sworn of my own Make  
 Oaths, Frighted Furies, & made Pluto quake:  
 Sw—d Whores more ways than ever Sodoms Walls  
 Knew, or the Colledge of the Cardinals:  
 Witness Heroic Scars and wounds: Ne're go!  
 Sear Cloths and Ulcers from the Top to th' Toe.  
 Frighted at my own Mischeifs I am fled,  
 And basely left my Life's Defendor Dead.  
 But hang't, why do I mencon these poor Things?  
 I have blasphem'd G—d, and libell'd Kings;  
 The readiest Way to Hell, Boy, Quick; (Boy) Ne're stir  
 The readiest way, my Lord's by Rochester.

Although it seems incredible that a poet could write so viciously of himself, I am persuaded that Rochester did so write. The poem is clearly his style of rough, vigorous verse, and his sense of irony was perfectly capable of such an attitude. Moreover, if we may disregard the assigned date, 1674, the line "And basely left my Life's Defendor Dead," is highly significant. This is certainly a reference to the affair at Epsom, in June, 1676, when Rochester acted the coward's part in a riot, and his "Life's Defendor," Captain Downes, was killed.<sup>2</sup> Of this affair, Rochester's enemy Sir Carr Scroope made much capital in a libel called "In Defense of Satire."<sup>3</sup> Particularly he wrote of Rochester as one who

To fatal mid-night quarrels can betray  
 His brave companion, and then run away,  
 Leaving him to be murder'd in the street,  
 Then put it off with some buffoon conceit.

Ebsworth suggested that the "buffoon conceit" was Rochester's line "for all men would be cowards if they durst," from the "Satyr against Mankind."<sup>4</sup> That line, however, is hardly a "buffoon conceit" within the Restoration meaning of the phrase. It is quite possible that Sir Carr was thinking of "The Earle of Rochester's Conference with a Post Boy."

J. HAROLD WILSON

*The Ohio State University*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hatton Correspondence*, pp. 133-134.

<sup>3</sup> *Miscellaneous Works of . . . Buckingham*, 1704.

<sup>4</sup> *Roxburghe Ballads*, iv, 570.

## THE CHARACTER IN THE ELIA ESSAYS

Character delineation forms the backbone of the Elia Essays. Of the forty-four non-critical essays in the *Essays of Elia* and *Last Essays of Elia*, thirty-six depend largely or altogether upon character sketching for their content and interest. Of the eight essays in which no character writing occurs, two are not essays, properly speaking, but extracts from letters ("Distant Correspondents" and "The Tombs in the Abbey"), one is occasional ("Rejoicing Upon The New Year's Coming of Age"), one is una fantasia, a report of a dream ("The Child Angel"), one contains anecdotes, rather than character sketches (On Books and Reading), and one is a description of newspapers to which Lamb had contributed ("Newspapers Thirty-five Years Ago"). Of the thirty-six which contain character writing, eight are devoted entirely to that form.<sup>1</sup> The remaining twenty-eight would be meatless without the portraits contained in them, though in one or two of the essays character drawing is introduced not formally or for itself or with any degree of continuity, but, as in "Grace Before Meat," the bits of portraits are a sort of grace or relish.

Lamb's penchant for character drawing can be ascribed to several reasons: first, his humanism, his delight in "odd fishes," "heads with some diverting twist in them"; second, his affectionate nature to which old friends and relatives were treasures to be lovingly preserved in his essays; and, third, his liking for the seventeenth century prose writers, whose books of characters may have caused him to attempt similar type characters. "The Convalescent" is an example, and "Imperfect Sympathies" contains excellent type characters of Scotchmen, Jews, Negroes, and Quakers. As a rule, however, Lamb is not content with the type alone. Sometimes, for instance, he uses it only as an introduction, as in "Poor Relations" which begins with a type character of a poor relation in the manner of Overbury and is followed by two individualized characters, one, Favel, for the tragic side of poor

<sup>1</sup> "Mrs. Battle's Opinions Upon Whist," "My Relations," "Old Benchers of the Inner Temple," "To the Shade of Ellitson and Ellitsoniana," "The Convalescent," "Captain Jackson," "The Superannuated Man," and Preface to the *Last Essays of Elia*.

relationship, the other to illustrate the comic possibilities.<sup>2</sup> It is not only Lamb's ability to limn the personality, the thing which marks, more than anything else, one individual from another, but his liking for self-portraiture which distinguishes his character drawing from that of the seventeenth century type writers. In this tendency Lamb is of his own time, though he is unlike his contemporaries in that he is rarely "confessional" and almost always humorous. But, no matter of what kind, it is Lamb's habit to illustrate with, when he does not devote his whole attention to, characters. He is uncomfortable and dissatisfied without the richness, piquancy, and variety of human temperament, mind, and manners. It is characteristic of him that his description of the old Margate Hoy is not of a boat, but of the people sailing in it; that his essay on the South Sea House has almost nothing to do with the House and everything with the men who worked there. "New Year's Eve" turns into an admirably humorous self-portrait. "Valentine's Day" offers an opportunity to illustrate a friend's character (Edward Burney); and Lamb is quite frank about it: "I only give this as a specimen of E. B. and his modest way of doing a concealed kindness." In "Mackery End" he cannot resist giving a full portrait of his sister. "Modern Gallantry" serves as an excuse for devoting half the essay to Joseph Paice, "the only pattern of consistent gallantry I have met with." When less than half of his composition upon chimney sweepers is past, Lamb leaves their praise for that of his friend Jem White, who occupies his pen for the remainder. He renders praise to Ellitson's Shade in a sort of character fantasy which is only an introductory fanfare, for he cannot rest there but must give "Ellitsoniana" in an anecdotal form that illustrates the actor's character to perfection.

Sometimes, in his eagerness, Lamb drags in characters by the ears to the detriment of structure in his essays and in a fashion almost absurd were it not for his enthusiasm. In "My First Play" he splits his essay with a character of his godfather Field, "the most gentlemanly of oilmen," and the essay is far gone before he reluctantly brings himself back to the proposed subject. In "Amicus Redivivus" he recounts an accident through which George Dyer comes near drowning, but leaves his dear friend suspended between life and death to give a character sketch of the

<sup>2</sup> See also "The Two Races of Men."

doctor who has been called in to revive him. Only when Lamb has exploited his latest find to his satisfaction do we learn the fate of the unfortunate Dyer. In "The Wedding" the important function involving a friend's daughter is held up to make a lengthy analysis of a type character of fond parents, male and female, as regards the marrying of a daughter.

In his best essays the characters are easily and naturally introduced, usually as an illustration of an idea. Ralph Bigod is employed in this way to illustrate the "greater race." In "Dream Children" the tone of affectionate and melancholy retrospect makes the introduction of the characters of grandmother Field and of his brother John in tune with the tender pathos of the whole. "Old China" while, on the surface, it is a bagatelle upon tea cups, gives a charming insight into the character of Bridget without which the essay would be commonplace. In any case, whether aesthetically satisfying or not, the backbone of the Elia Essays is character drawing.<sup>3</sup>

VARLEY LANG

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

#### COLERIDGE'S MOUNT ABORA

Light may be thrown on Coleridge's Mount Abora by an entry in the first volume of the Reverend Clement Cruttwell's *New Universal Gazetteer; or, Geographical Dictionary* (3 vols., London, 1798): "Abur, a mountain of Arabia, in the country of Yemen: 4 German miles WSW. Kataba." Cruttwell's residence at Bath suggests relationship with the Bath printer, R. Cruttwell, who printed Bowles' *Sonnets* as well as Southey's and Lovell's *Poems*.

HENRY PETTIT

*The University of Colorado*

---

<sup>3</sup> I have not included "Popular Fallacies" in this article; but even here, where the nature of the subject and shortness of each section might preclude it, character drawing occurs. Another essay, "The Confessions of a Drunkard" is unique. It is a mock sermon in the form of a character sketch in the first person.

BORROWINGS FROM ANATOLE FRANCE BY  
WILLA CATHER AND ROBERT NATHAN

In *Anatole France, 1844-1896* Professor E. P. Dargan states that Mme France possessed a dressmaker's model which exasperated her husband and which he finally tore to pieces.<sup>1</sup> We may therefore assume that the dressmaker's model which was kept in the study of M. Bergeret, the hero of France's novel, *le Mannequin d'osier*, is autobiographical. The Bergeret model is interesting for another reason also. It has been adapted by two contemporary American novelists, who are indebted to Anatole France for the idea of placing it in the study of a scholar.

Miss Willa Cather, in *The Professor's House*, introduces two dressmaker's models. They stand in an attic room where the hero, Professor St. Peter, composes his books and articles in the field of European history. The author acknowledges her indebtedness to Anatole France by making St. Peter say, with respect to the models: "If they were good enough for Monsieur Bergeret, they are certainly good enough for me."<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Robert Nathan's novel *Winter in April* concerns a cynical but kindly old scholar, his adored granddaughter, his capable sister, his young disciple, his extraordinary maid, and a dressmaker's model. Here, except for the absence of a wife and the substitution of a granddaughter for a daughter, we have the leading characters from *le Mannequin d'osier*. Ellen, the granddaughter, sells her party gown for a charitable purpose. Henry Pennifer, her grandfather, discovers the gown on a dress-model in the window of a fashionable shop. Stealing the model as well as the gown, he takes it back to his study, where "at this moment she stands . . . beside my desk, giving a strange appearance to the familiar room."<sup>3</sup>

ELIOT G. FAY

*The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.*


---

<sup>1</sup> E. P. Dargan, *Anatole France, 1844-1896* (New York, 1937), 381, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Willa Cather, *The Professor's House* (New York, 1925), 19.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Nathan, *Winter in April* (New York, 1937), 220, 21.

## REVIEWS

---

*De Quincey: A Portrait.* By JOHN CALVIN METCALF. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 210. \$2.00.

*The Age of Tennyson.* By G. M. YOUNG. Warton Lecture on English Poetry, British Academy, 1939. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xxv. London: Humphrey Milford, 1939. Pp. 20. \$0.60.

*On the Diction of Tennyson, Browning and Arnold.* By BERNARD GROOM. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. 56. \$1.25. S. P. E., Tract No. liii.

*Arnold: Poetry and Prose*, with William Watson's Poem and Essays by Lionel Johnson and H. W. Garrod. With an introduction and notes by E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xxxvi + 187. \$1.25.

Metcalf's *De Quincey* is a charmingly written, beautifully printed book, offering, as the Author says in his Foreword, "no contribution to knowledge"; merely a portrait. And the portrait is brilliantly drawn. The volume is the most vivid study of De Quincey yet to appear; but to those who have long awaited it, it brings some, perhaps unjustifiable, disappointments.

We could hardly have expected many new facts. Few can be expected after the volume of Mr. Sackville-West, the Hogg Letters edited by Professor Bonner, the articles by Professor Forward, and my edition of the *Diary of 1803* and my *Life*. Even the unpublished correspondence with Tait which has recently and unexpectedly turned up would seem to add little significant information, although I have not seen it. But we had hoped that Dr. Metcalf might have brought us new interpretations, perhaps a psychological analysis based on modern techniques; or a study of De Quincey's contributions to philosophy, economics and politics. As a matter of fact he does not relate De Quincey to the thought of his time in any way. If it is unkind to express disappointment when Dr. Metcalf wished to do something quite different, it will be worth while to point out that there are De Quinceyan problems still awaiting scholars.

But there are legitimate complaints against the volume in hand. First, there are careless statements which continue errors of older biographies which recent studies have corrected. I offer a few

typical examples: on page 18, it was not *Lord* Carbery who encouraged riding lessons at Laxton, but *Lady* Carbery (see my *Life*, p. 55). Nor did De Quincey's visit to Ireland last "far into the autumn" (page 16); for he left Westport on his way to England on 8 September (*Life*, p. 50). On page 50, De Quincey is said to have been "keeping terms" at the Middle Temple "before quitting Oxford or immediately afterwards." But the only record at the Middle Temple is that he was entered on 12 June, 1812 (*Life*, p. 199). And on page 190, "Mrs. MacBold" appears as one of the demon landladies; although so far as I know, she is the creation of Emerson's poor memory or of the entertaining gossip of Dr. Brown and Mrs. Crowe (*Life*, p. 452 n.). And on page 81, De Quincey was not introduced to Taylor and Hessey by Lamb, but by Talfourd, as De Quincey himself tells us (Masson, *De Quincey's Works*, III, 271); and we have other confirmatory evidence of this. Dr. Metcalf tells us in the Foreword that his book "was completed before the appearance of several recent books on De Quincey's life and work." One could wish that he had revised it in the light of their findings.

Second, in the later years when the evidence of De Quincey's reminiscences gives way to the harsh evidence of letter, court records and memoirs, Dr. Metcalf tends to overlook some of the darker implications. There is the distressing attitude towards Wilson which comes out most clearly in the conversations in London in 1821 recorded by Woodhouse. There is the hardness, almost persecution complex, in relation to De Quincey's creditors, especially in the case of some of his landlords and landladies who tend in his imagination to become "devils," when they were merely trying to earn a precarious living by renting rooms. There is the disquieting guile which he showed in regard to the mortgage on The Nab and to the borrowings on his future prospects of a legacy from his mother. One could name other attitudes which distress the lover of De Quincey, which I claim to be. But of these shadows Dr. Metcalf seems to be mostly unaware so that the portrait he presents lacks, to my mind, complete truth.

As a result of the limited aim of the book, Dr. Metcalf offers us little searching criticism of the essays, although I commend warmly the chapter in which he gives an interesting and careful appraisal of the papers upon Coleridge, Wordsworth, etc. which gave so much offense at the time of their appearance. He points out that De Quincey's interest was in what we call "journalism" and that he offered real portraits far in advance of his time—if one overlooks Carlyle's description of Coleridge in his *Life of Sterling*!

In spite of its shortcomings, the book has more than enough virtues to make it a delightful introduction to the Opium Eater and one certain to tempt the reader to try De Quincey's writings for himself.

When G. M. Young speaks upon the Victorian Era, as in *The*

*Portrait of an Age* and here, less learned and imaginative scholars must listen. Relations, implications and patterns take on new clarity. In this brilliant lecture, not without some of the overtones of James Joyce's priceless pun, "Alfred Lawn-Tennyson" is examined as offering his time what it demanded so that he deservedly became *The Poet* of the Nineteen Hundreds; not only speaking the language of England but of the whole western world in that age which in certain aspects is so terribly remote from ours. His was the perfect adjustment of a man of letters to "the climate of opinion." His descriptive power met the needs of contemporary senses refined by the Romantic poets; met the interest in Natural History, the love of landscape stimulated by travel and drawing until "devotion to nature became a nervous craving." His description was devoured by a public becoming "in spirit suburban . . . instinctively fighting for breath." And furthermore he offered such accuracy as to satisfy the men of science themselves and tended "to constrict for a time our range of poetry." He gave a moral age gnomie, hortatory, public utterance; and decorous eroticism, characterised by the American school-boy (quoted by Mr. Young): "There is some pretty hot necking in Lord Tennyson, only they never quite make it." He appealed to respectability, involved in Victorian society with the idea of bettering oneself and one's family, in line with the whole range of progress and evolution; a society so devoid of the comic spirit as to be eager for vapidity and the "embarrassingly silly." And he offered a consoling religious faith emphatically called for, namely that in an evanescent world man is not an incident but a consummation.

The freshness of the lecture is in its approach to Tennyson from the standpoint of his public and in its richness of generalisation and memorable phrasing.

Mr. Groom gives us a first-rate verbal study concerned with the word habits of a great triumvirate and evolving fresh critical observations. Each poet is separately studied and the unity is secured by contrast. The author has a keen mind, aware that words and style are "unconsciously autobiographical." While he does not elaborate upon the autobiographical implications, his comments point the way to elaboration. Every student of the poets will find happy confirmation of biographical characteristics in such phrases as the following: Tennyson's "general attitude is not that of a man speaking to men, nor is he on quite easy terms with contemporary life" (page 98); Browning's "inner life was so robust that he delighted to rub shoulders with the outer world . . . his work reflects many aspects of the language of his time; it is a magazine of colloquial phrases" (page 118); and Arnold "seems to be putting a strain upon his invention, for felicitous expressions in one piece are sometimes almost exactly repeated in another" (page 144).

More specifically, Mr. Groom contrasts Tennyson's conscious use

of "poetic" word and phrase for aesthetic effect with Browning's use of them "as makeshifts" and Arnold's deliberate avoidance of the entangling romantic tradition; Tennyson's avoidance of colloquial language with Browning's excessive use of it in giving his monologuists "absolute freedom" of expression. Tennyson is word-minded, stippling his verse; Browning is a word collector, "centrifugal" in diction; and Arnold, except within the narrow range of his best inspiration, is concerned not with words—often unfortunate—but with the whole.

Most of the study scrutinizes words themselves—neologisms, compounds, archaisms, "poetic" words, etc. and what the poets do with them. It is not statistical, but richly representative and accompanied by careful footnotes. The brochure is difficult to summarize, for it is full of meat. It is important for any student of the Victorian period and unexpectedly rewarding.

The Arnold volume is put out under the protection of distinguished names, yet the whole is "somewhat lazily handled." Even the introduction is merely an adaptation of E. K. Chambers's Warton lecture, and his notes, while careful, are of the most meager sort. The poems are, of course, selected and the prose is not only selected but cut up into snippets. The essays of Johnson, Garrod and Chambers are fine pieces of critical writing, sensitive and agreeable. But there is little indication that Arnold is *of* his time and says anything *to* his time. If Arnold knew, as Garrod says, "very little about the history of literature and he liked to think (what may be true) that great poetry drops from the skies," certainly the present editor acts as if he thought so too. The book belongs to an outmoded method of teaching literature and would seem to be a rather futile contribution to the modern classroom.

HORACE A. EATON

*Syracuse University*

---

*The Road to Tryermaine*, A Study of the History, Background, and Purposes of Coleridge's "Christabel." By ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT. The University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. ix + 230. \$3.00.

As the title of Professor Nethercot's book indicates, we are offered here a companion volume to Professor J. L. Lowes' *Road to Xanadu*, which was welcomed some years ago as a masterpiece of creative criticism. Professor Nethercot has followed the method of his great predecessor, but very wisely has refrained from giving as a subtitle to his work, "A Study in the Ways of the Imagination." Because whereas in *The Road to Xanadu* one seemed to be brought into a closer intimacy with the workings of Coleridge's mind than criticism had ever achieved before with almost any author,

*The Road to Tryermaine* does not strike one as containing more exciting revelations than can be gathered in any diligent and—as the French would say—*fouillé* study of sources. Professor Lowes' method is there, but his marvelous power of illuminating association, his insight into the operations of the "hooked atoms" of memory are absent; and perhaps all is said when we say that Professor Lowes' own imagination is that of an artist, and Professor Nethercot's mind is that of the industrious scholar. We would have refrained from this invidious comparison, if the title itself of the book had not challenged it, and if Professor Nethercot himself had not claimed to have unveiled that very mystery which would have been only skirted by Professor Lowes.

But first of all, does *Christabel*, or what is left of *Christabel*, deserve to be called "the most fascinating and enigmatic of literary conundrums"? We may doubt it when we read (p. 139); "Just what principles Coleridge intended to embody in Geraldine will probably never be known with absolute dogmatism. Apparently he was none too clear on the subject himself, or he would not have undergone the abortive agonies that he did to finish his story satisfactorily." A riddle can be solved the elements of which are hidden away, but exist somewhere; but how would it be possible to find out the original ingredients of what was never a complete design, but an inchoate and imperfect sketch, about which the author was none too clear himself? Professor Nethercot is well aware of this difficulty, since he compares his reconstruction to "an *ex pede Herculem* affair—or the sketching of a unicorn from a shard of hoof, a shoulder blade, and a piece of corkscrewed horn," and who can say what Hercules and the unicorn really looked like, since they never existed? The very moment one is convinced that Coleridge himself was none too clear on the subject of his poem, a great part of its fascination vanishes, because our curiosity is doomed to find nothing to feed on.

So Professor Nethercot could never satisfy us with real food; but just with a full course of plausible surrogates whose effect on our system is certainly filling, even if not absolutely stimulating. I do not mean to imply that his research into the nature of vampires, lamias, etc. is off the point; he no doubt succeeds in classifying Geraldine as a member of that terrifying class of monsters, in fact as the first vampire which was ever introduced into English literature, and he rightly wonders how a critic of genius like Professor Lowes or a dabbler in the occult like Mr. Montague Summers could miss that discovery. But then, what of it? What is Geraldine actually doing to *Christabel*? We are seized with unspeakable horror while reading Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw*, although its mystery is never fully revealed, or rather, is revealed only to our subconscious; but do we experience a similar thrill in reading *Christabel*? Or rather do we see our dream tail-

ing off like Charles Lamb's marine vision in "Witches and other Night-fears"?

I think there is a moment in which Professor Nethercot's reconstruction is on the point of becoming really exciting, when he writes (p. 69):

Yet not only is Geraldine a woman, with vampire characteristics; in the second canto Christabel also shows unmistakable signs of turning into the same sort of creature. In her manner, in her appearance, in the sounds she utters, she imitates all that is most sinister in her previous night's bed-fellow. Whatever Geraldine may be, Christabel is clearly being transformed into a similar being—likewise through no fault or willingness of her own. Those who have been infected with a vampire become vampires themselves.

And when he completes this interpretation on p. 128 with these words:

What is more likely, then, than that Coleridge, in deciding to brand Geraldine with some mark symbolical of her sin, should have delineated it in terms of serpentry, and especially, perhaps, in terms of a snake preparing for rejuvenation and ready to shed its old skin for a new one?

After all this, we would have expected a conclusion not unlike that of Poe's "Ligeia," the more so, that Poe, in making the victim Rowena Lady of *Tremaine*, seems to have had at the back of his mind Coleridge's *Tryermaine*, or, shall we say, such an interpretation of *Christabel* as is sketched in the passages just referred to. Could Geraldine, woman and sinner, free herself of her mark of shame on condition that she should transfer it to such a pure creature as Christabel? Is it a case akin to that of Melmoth the Wanderer?

Such a possibility seems to be ruled out by Professor Nethercot in the course of his book; he questions the diabolical nature of Geraldine, sees in her "an unwilling and contrite instrument of destiny," and concludes with finding Derwent Coleridge's interpretation "substantially justified." According to this interpretation, "the sufferings of Christabel were to have been represented as vicarious, endured for her 'lover far away'; and Geraldine, no witch or goblin, or malignant being of any kind, but a spirit, executing her appointed task with the best good will." Only thus Professor Nethercot finds a link with Coleridge's alleged inspiration from Crashaw's "Hymn to the Name and Honor of the Admirable Sainte Teresa": Christabel, like Christ whose name is contained in hers, and like the Spanish Saint, would suffer a "vicarious" martyrdom; atone for the sins of other people. Is then Geraldine playing the part of the wounding Seraphim in St. Teresa's famous vision?

I think that there is much to be said against this whitewashing of Geraldine into, almost, a "fair sister of the Seraphim." There is a clue which Professor Nethercot has not taken up; it lies in an

apparently harmless descriptive line of the poem, l. 34 of the First Part:

And naught was green upon the oak  
But moss and rarest misletoe.

It might at first seem of little moment that Coleridge should have been recollecting here a line from *Titus Andronicus*, II, iii, 95:

The trees, though summer, yet forlorn and lean,  
O'ercome with moss and baleful mistletoe.

But if one glances at the context from which these lines are taken, one is suddenly aware that the sinister wood described by Tamora, and her own feigned story of violence, are paralleled in the setting of the opening portion of *Christabel* and in Geraldine's story of how she suffered violence at the hands of five warriors. Tamora says that her persecutors threatened to bind her "unto the body of a dismal yew," so that she should die or fall mad at the fearful cries of fiends and hissing snakes which would congregate at the spot "at dead time of the night." Geraldine says that her abductors tied her on a palfrey and then placed her underneath the oak where Christabel finds her. Tamora is a diabolical liar; if Coleridge thought of her while writing his lines about Geraldine's plight, is it not obvious to conclude that he conceived Geraldine as a wicked hypocrite like Tamora, enlisting assistance under false pretences? Would "an unwilling and contrite instrument of destiny" bear comparison with such a monster as Tamora? Surely "the maid devoid of guile and sin" who

. . . passively did imitate  
That look of dull and treacherous hate

was the victim of an *envoûtement* designed to no such Christian purpose as a vicarious atonement of sin!

Professor Nethercot's contribution extends beyond the chief point in the poem, the meaning of Geraldine; he has been able to trace the names and local habitations in the poem, and makes good fun of Donald R. Tuttle's pretended discovery of sources. One wonders whether sometimes his own subtlety has not been led astray, as for instance when he traces an elaborate origin (p. 156 ff.) for "the lamp with twofold silver chain . . . fastened to an angel's feet," a common enough article in Catholic churches all over the continent of Europe; or when he associates "Peak and pine!" with the penances in Dante's *Purgatory*. The operations of the "hooked atoms" of memory are not laid bare in these last cases as in Professor Lowes' work; there is no cogency of demonstration.

MARIO PRAZ

*Università di Roma*

*Shakespeare in Germany 1740-1815.* Edited by R. PASCAL. Cambridge, Eng.: The University Press, 1937. Pp. x + 199. \$2.50.

*Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama des Barock.* By MAX DEUTSCHBEIN. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, n. d. Pp. iv + 130. RM 6 (paper) or RM 7 (cloth).

*Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds.* By PETER WILHELM BIESTERFELDT. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1936. Pp. iii + 115. RM 12.

*Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England (von der Reformation bis zum frühen 18. Jahrhundert).* HEINRICH ARNEKE. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. vi + 355. RM 13.50.

The main purpose of Pascal's *Shakespeare in Germany 1740-1815* is to make readily accessible to students the more important Shakespearean criticism which appeared in Germany before 1827, but the book will be very useful also to scholars. Hitherto one has had to search for the material in scattered places, and some of the works have been rather hard to obtain outside Germany. Within the available space, the editor has made a judicious selection; in fact, it is really amazing how much significant material has been assembled into the one volume. The "Introduction" is a thirty-six-page running account of Shakespearean criticism in Germany during the period covered, most of the quotations being translated into English for the benefit of persons whose command of German is not adequate for reading the passages in the original; stressing "that the attitude to Shakespeare in this period is not merely a matter of aesthetic appreciation, but is, even more, a part of a changing moral and social outlook," the editor suggests "connections between the aesthetic, moral and social principles raised by the writings on Shakespeare" (p. ix). The book includes twenty-three pages of fragmentary German translations of Shakespeare (by Mendelssohn, Lessing, and others) and extracts from complete translations (by Borck and others). A nine-page "Chronological Table" in three parallel columns is valuable for giving a bird's-eye view of (1) "Criticism, Biography, etc.," (2) "Translations, Adaptations, Synopses," and (3) "Productions" in Germany from 1682 to 1836. (Incidentally, Mylius' translation [dated 1749—issued in the spring of 1750] of Voltaire's *Lettres sur les Anglais* is misdated as 1753.)

Deutschbein, in *Shakespeares Macbeth als Drama der Barock*, classifies *Julius Caesar*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Hamlet* as "Renaissance" dramas, and *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and

*Antony and Cleopatra* as "Baroque" tragedies. He states the fundamental difference between the two groups as follows:

Der charakteristische Unterschied zwischen den Renaissance- und Barockdramen liegt nun darin, dass der harmonische Kosmismus vollständig gebrochen erscheint und einer dualistischen, antithetischen Auffassung der Welt weicht. . . . Der Mensch ist nicht mehr der Mittelpunkt eines geordneten Seins, sondern er ist in seiner Existenz unmittelbar bedroht, denn die entscheidenden, Existenz schaffenden Kräfte sind nicht mehr menschlicher Art, sondern sie sind jenseits aller menschlichen Natur, in einer metaphysischen, über die Natur hinausgehenden Existenzform vorhanden (p. 9).

There is a struggle between "Dämonie" and "Logos" (Chap. 4); according to p. 91, the former seems to be destructive forces, and the latter constructive forces. The conception of "Dämonie" is based upon Goethe's: "Vielmehr ist das Dämonische weder göttlicher noch menschlicher noch teuflischer Natur, sondern es ist eine Synthese von entgegengesetzten Qualitäten" (p. 20). In *Macbeth* the main scene of this conflict is in the soul of the title character (p. 47), who has a dual nature: (1) certain "dämonische Anlagen" and (2) "ein starkes Bewusstsein von der Existenz der Wertwelt, die für ihn die Grundlage seiner sozialen Bindungen ist" (p. 49). Demoniac forces which influence Macbeth are the Weird Sisters and Lady Macbeth (p. 79). To increase the "Baroque" atmosphere, Shakespeare uses two innovations in the technique of characterization in *Macbeth* (to what extent these are employed in the other "Baroque" tragedies is not clearly stated). One is animal symbolism; for instance, Macbeth is associated with the wolf and the bear (p. 88), and Lady Macbeth with the snake (p. 92). The other innovation is a sort of magic picture ("magisches Merkbild"); for instance, something like a spell that prevents Lady Macbeth from killing Duncan comes upon her when she sees his resemblance to her father (p. 94). The use of foils—which are contrasting figures without significance of their own, such as the hired murderers in relationship to Macbeth—reaches its peak in *Macbeth* (Chap. 21). Deutschbein's book is stimulating, and many parts are fascinating to read. In the judgment of the reviewer, however, some of the conclusions are not justified, such as the contention that "equivocation" is the main problem in *Macbeth* (Chap. 3) rather than that the references to equivocation in the Porter's speeches (ii, iii) probably are merely incidental satire on the Jesuits; moreover, the main thesis and some of the subordinate conclusions depend so much upon comparisons among the seven dramas classed by the author as "Renaissance" or "Baroque" that similar analyses of the other six plays would be desirable (and analyses of certain plays before 1599 by Shakespeare and others would also be helpful). Some of

the terminology seems unnecessarily complicated; some merely probable dates (those of *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*) are assumed to be definite (p. 7); and, in discussions of innovations, a weakness in method is that in only one instance is there a differentiation between what Shakespeare found in the main source and what he added.

Biesterfeldt's *Die dramatische Technik Thomas Kyds*, in spite of its comprehensive title, treats only *The Spanish Tragedy*. The most significant parts of the volume are Chapter iv ("Die szenische Darstellung") and Chapter v ("Der dramatische Aufbau"), which contain interesting contributions. The former is an illuminating investigation of the staging of the play, discussing chiefly on what portion of the stage each scene was presented. Among the conclusions of Chapter v are the following: (1) that, in respect to the point of the story at which the play begins, *The Spanish Tragedy* is a compromise between the traditional English drama, which begins *ab ovo* (that is, would have opened with the great battle in which Don Andrea was killed), and the classical school, which concentrates upon the last phase (that is, would have started after the murder of Horatio); and (2) that Kyd's piece made an important advance toward Shakespeare's technique by being built up more systematically from scene to scene in regard to the total effect than was customary in English plays, of which the old *King Lear* is typical. The author agrees with those who believe that the present Act III was originally divided into two acts, but his new argument, based upon his structural analysis, is not very convincing (pp. 83-85). The first three chapters, which are really introductory, contain much unessential material; for instance, the plot synopsis of nearly four pages is superfluous, inasmuch as one must be familiar with the text itself to understand the discussion, and a person not acquainted with the tragedy would hardly be interested in such a specialized study. A seven-page bibliography suggests that the author made a thorough investigation of his problem.

The title of Arneke's *Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England* is somewhat misleading. The work is not a history of events but consists chiefly of discussions of the significant writings (1) of outstanding British Protestant theologians (John Foxe, Matthew Parker, James Ussher, Thomas Fuller, Jeremy Collier, and Edward Stillingfleet) and (2) of prominent British writers on jurisprudence (Edward Coke, Roger Twysden, John Selden, and Matthew Hale) from about 1550 to about 1750. Within the scope attempted, the book is a well-planned and careful piece of work and should prove valuable to English literary historians and others desiring a survey of the two fields treated or a guide for intensive study of individual authors. Aids for the latter purpose are a thirty-one-page classified bibliography (with some bio-

graphical data) of significant writings published from 1538 to 1763 and a five-page list of pertinent modern works.

PAUL P. KIES

*State College of Washington*

---

*D. H. Lawrence and Susan His Cow.* By WILLIAM YORK TINDALL.  
New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xvi + 231. \$2.75.

*Modern Poetry and the Tradition.* By CLEANTH BROOKS. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 253. \$3.00.

No two books could be more disparate within a field than these of Mr. Tindall and Mr. Brooks. Mr. Tindall so belabours the accident of what he dislikes that he comes to identify the whole substance of his material with it; his work is criticism, if at all, only by an act of violence. His book on D. H. Lawrence shows, from an alien point of view, the least sympathy for motive, the least charity for deed, and the most positive animus in construction outside the critical writings of H. L. Mencken and Irving Babbitt. Lacking the drive of Mencken and the conceptual vigour of Babbitt—lacking too any grace of the language—his book shows as at bottom frivolous. You cannot use it in the effort to understand Lawrence, but only as a substitute for that effort. Even its putative usefulness as a counter-irritant disappears when you resume Lawrence's text.

This judgment would not be worth making if it were not analogous to the judgment that must be made on almost everything that has been written about Lawrence—excepting notably what has been written by Gregory, Eliot, and Huxley; and it makes no difference in the judgment whether the effort was, as with Mr. Tindall, to attack by substitution, to adopt for aggrandizement as with Mrs. Luhan, or, as with so many, just an effort to merge the critic's self in the quicksand aspect of Lawrence. The judgment is, that none of them deals much with the objective value of what Lawrence wrote—which may be what is commonly overlooked but which alone has any effect. What these books show is the enormous attractive force of Lawrence as a *possible* figure, a symbol, a myth, of the essential sickness of our time: which is the sickness of the untenable position. Mr. Tindall is on the side of those who see the untenableness and nothing else, who see nothing of the strength of imagination and sensibility which brought Lawrence to occupy it, the great strength without which the great weakness would not have mattered, the strength, precisely, which brought Mr. Tindall as well as those who oppose him to make criticism of Lawrence.

Mr. Tindall's plan was so to explore the "wider significance" of Susan the cow as a means "to a better understanding of some of the problems of our literature, society, judgment, and taste." The tone—the prejudice of manner—with which he conducts his exploration prevents his success. Mr. Brooks, too, had a thesis, that there has been during the last generation "a critical revolution of the order of the Romantic Revolt"; so that it becomes necessary once more, as with Wordsworth and Coleridge, to relate the contemporary with the traditional. Any account which ignored that relation, says Mr. Brooks, would not "succeed in making us aware of the full significance of modern poetry—probably [would] not succeed in making modern poetry intelligible." It is the limitation of his essay that he relates modern poetry chiefly to the tradition as it stood in the first half of the seventeenth century, thus following the critical work of Eliot. Because the limitation is a matter of sympathy and training and not of prejudice and ignorance, its action is largely heuristic: it helps him discover facts and possibilities in modern poetry, enables him for the most part to maintain contact with it, and as constantly drives his reader into the poetry and not aside from it. The version of poetry his book makes is not complete; it is not the only version; but it is usable and helpful with regard to other versions—with regard to those inchoate, cumulative versions which we all of us actually employ as we read. His theory is, in effect, a means of organizing the values he feels, which, organized, encourage close and stimulating observation of facts about the verse he chooses to deal with. Only where the facts fail, does the thesis intrude: which is the case with all theses in any field of thinking, and represents merely the radical weakness of the mind itself. No mind can work long, and some minds cannot work at all without the aid of a thesis, a set of principles, a revelation, as primary tool; and all minds suffer again and again from the tendency to overelaborate tools at the expense of the work to be done. The work is too difficult, suddenly at some point alien; the tools are our own and come by quick habit easy to use. Facility marks us; we make criticism for criticism's sake.

The point is that readers of good will can ignore all but the playing value of tools and terms and frames and scaffolds, and fasten on the discovered values, the job of work actually done by the critic who, first, has himself shown good will towards his material. He will so find his sensibility absorbed, where argument would merely have exhausted it. In Mr. Brooks' essays—for they are not single but deliberately loose about his thesis—it is the discoveries that count, equally for him and for us. The rehearsal of Eliot's *Waste Land*, even after eighteen years' familiarity with that poem, discovers the substance of it afresh; so does the comment on Yeats' two poems about Byzantium. Again, the essay on Frost, MacLeish, and Auden, for example, is full of discriminations which, whether made in poetry alone or elsewhere as well, seem especially

worth putting forward in these deprived days. "Irony which maintains an equilibrium between opposed attitudes, irony which acts as a stabilizing force, is hardly to be found in MacLeish's poetry at all. His best poetry is of a kind to which such irony is irrelevant. . . . MacLeish's sensibility is rich but lacks principles. His poetry does not have the intricacy of idea necessary to the poetry of a poet like Yeats. . . . If MacLeish represents the unprincipled sensibility, Auden represents, possibly, the sensibility fortified with principles, or perhaps, changing the viewpoint, the sensibility at the mercy of a set of principles." However that may be, and whether our time is deprived or merely interdicted, the point here wanted is plain; that by exploration of the actual operative sensibility of the writers in hand, Mr. Brooks does succeed, where Mr. Tindall fails, in promoting "a better understanding of some of the problems of our literature, society, judgment, and taste."

R. P. BLACKMUR

Princeton University

---

*The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving.* By HENRY B. WOOLF. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 299. \$4.

In *The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving*, Henry B. Woolf has made a significant contribution to the literature of onomatology. This work is designed to serve three purposes: it is "historical in that it is an attempt to describe with completeness and accuracy certain customs of the Germanic peoples of the early Middle Ages; it is literary in that it throws light on several passages in *Beowulf*; but it may best be described as philological" in the wider sense of the term.

In order to accomplish these ends, Dr. Woolf examines in turn the name-giving practices of the ruling houses in each of the Old English kingdoms, those of certain non-royal English families, those evident in Old English heroic poetry, and finally those of whatever other Germanic peoples he is able to secure material on, ranging from the Scandinavians in the North to the Langobards in the South and the Burgundians in the West. In each case the examination is followed by whatever conclusions may be drawn concerning the following points: the proportion of dithematic names as compared with monothematic, the extent and nature of alliteration, of theme variation whether initial or final, of repetition, the use of nicknames, and finally the influence of women on the naming practices of these peoples.

At the very outset of his study it was necessary for Dr. Woolf to establish genealogies for those families with which he is concerned.

In doing so, he chose to reexamine the available source material and to draw his own conclusions rather than to accept the genealogies already available in such works as Lappenberg and Earle. This fresh reconsideration alone would serve to make Dr. Woolf's study a highly important contribution, for Lappenberg's work is more than one hundred years old and even Earle's antedates the present century. Naturally Dr. Woolf has been able to take advantage of recent scholarship on moot points, and although his genealogies in the main do not differ radically from those of his predecessors, such conclusions as that of the identification of the Wessex kings *Cutha* and *Cuthwulf* as the same person are important for the present-day reader.

It is scarcely to the purpose here to present in review Dr. Woolf's findings in respect to each of the stylistic qualities with which the investigation is concerned, nor do his results lend themselves to easy briefing. Every reader will be grateful, however, for the concise summary, on page 93, of the practices of the various Old English royal families in respect to front- and end-variation and for the tabular presentations of name themes in each discussion of this matter. The discovery of the greater prevalence of monothematic names in the lower classes as late as the eleventh century is of especial interest, and the suggestion that there is here a survival of older custom is, I believe, perfectly sound.

The discussion of *Beowulf* in the light of the historical evidence about name-giving practices is provocative particularly for its repetition of the suggestion (made first by Malone and discussed elsewhere more extensively by Woolf) that *Beowulf* may have been a nickname, and that the Geatish hero was in reality the *Ælfhere* who is mentioned in line 2604 of the poem. Dr. Woolf also does the student of *Beowulf* a service by pointing out that the names of the Danes who appear in this poem are bound together by characteristics other than alliteration in *h*. In this connection it may be noted that the author follows Malone in his reconstruction of the name of Healfdene's daughter, and indeed the whole treatment of the *Beowulf* leans heavily upon Professor Malone's work.

For me the least satisfactory portion of Dr. Woolf's study was his attempt to determine the feminine influence in the giving of names. Although the problem must necessarily have loomed large in the author's examination of his materials, the results seem so inconclusive that they might well have been omitted from the completed work. Moreover, I am very dubious about the assumption which is stated as follows in connection with the naming practices of the Langobards: "In three cases the names of the children show maternal influence, the father apparently having had no say in the selection of his children's names." Must one conclude that a name theme drawn from the mother's family is necessarily chosen over and above the protests of the father? Is it not conceivable, particularly in a situation where the maternal family is of higher rank

than that of the father, that the father might not be proud and even eager to select a name theme from the mother's family?

I must confess also to some difficulty in following Dr. Woolf's graphic presentation of genealogical relationships. He was faced with the problem of fitting short bits of context in between many of his tables, so he chose to present these in single page widths instead of the double pages which are more frequently employed. In situations where large families are involved, this frequently necessitates a dropping of the descendants of one brother below those of another instead of the more desirable horizontal alignment, and some confusion is likely to result.

The real contribution that Dr. Woolf has made to the scholarship of this subject lies in the synthesis which his work presents. Many of the problems which he considers have been the subjects of special studies; some of them admirable but generally limited in scope. Merely to have made an examination of the names from the Old English heroic poetry alongside of an analysis of the name-giving practices of the Anglo-Saxons themselves would have constituted a step in advance of any study which has been made up to now; to present all this, however, in the light of an onomatological analysis of the other Germanic peoples, is to give a third dimension to what otherwise would have been a flat picture. Moreover, I wish to cite the concluding chapter in particular as an evidence of the wholly commendable objectivity and sanity with which the whole task has been carried out.

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT

*University of Michigan*

---

*A Milton Handbook. Third Edition.* By JAMES HOLLY HANFORD. New York: Crofts, 1939. Pp. xii + 439. \$2.10.

*Milton in Chancery.* By J. MILTON FRENCH. New York: Modern Language Association, 1939. Pp. x + 428. \$3.00.

*Milton's Literary Milieu.* By GEORGE WESLEY WHITING. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 401. \$3.50.

The third edition of Professor Hanford's *Milton Handbook* is seventy-three pages longer than its predecessor. The bibliography is strengthened by the addition of 109 titles (only twenty-seven of which could have been included before), but is marred by the unfortunate dropping of Gilbert's *Geographical Dictionary* and the edition of the familiar letters by the Tillyards. The most striking revisions and additions include a new appendix on "Milton and the Universities," a considerably augmented chapter on "Style

and Versification," an altered introduction to the prose, augmented notes on the composition and cosmology of *Paradise Lost*, and a concise summary of recent opinion and investigation. As a means of keeping perspective on Miltonic studies the *Handbook* is indispensable. Nearly 130 new footnotes and many revisions of opinion in the text give evidence of the critical speculations of the past decade.

The biographical materials discovered since Masson seemed to Hanford in his second edition "mere gleanings"; now they are "considerable." Professor French's long and formidable *Milton in Chancery* is an excellent case in point. This careful, fully documented study of ten law suits involving the Miltons, father and son, offers no new answer to the perplexing questions in Milton biography; rather, it provides us with the kind of data which has tantalized, not satisfied, the biographers of Shakespeare. It is source material, and "confines itself to the presentation of the facts, from which the reader is free to draw his own conclusions." *Milton in Chancery* is, therefore, a volume to put on the shelf beside Hamilton's *Original Papers*, Hunter's *Sheaf of Gleanings*, Marsh's *Papers*, and similar contributions—some of which it supplements, some it supersedes. Its text consists of 146 pages; its notes and appendices, almost 250 pages. A full index promises to be especially useful.

One finishes this book (which, through no fault of the author, is not easy reading) with respect for French's thorough research, and with willing assent to the one inference which the writer permits himself: "Milton was certainly not a star who dwelt apart from the workaday life of the world. . . . His character was built to no small degree on the years in Chancery." In his introduction French had anticipated this conclusion by declaring: "If any statement ever made about Milton was more untrue and misleading than Wordsworth's famous dictum, that Milton was 'like a star and dwelt apart,' it must be difficult to discover." But Wordsworth spoke of Milton's *soul*, not Milton, and the remainder of this famous (and misunderstood) sonnet sings the Milton that England then, and now, hath need of—for reasons which French rightly emphasizes.

Professor Whiting also seeks to show that Milton did not dwell apart, but in every other respect *Milton's Literary Milieu* is unlike French's book. It is composed of fourteen chapters and two appendices, each essentially independent, each dealing with the contemporary background of some Miltonic conceptions. The author ranges over a variety of subjects—the story of the Creation, the history of the world, Milton's use of maps, melancholy, pagan deities, Samson, the background of divers pamphlets—but hardly enough to achieve the professed aim: "to survey somewhat systematically and comprehensively the contemporary setting of Milton's work." Whiting desires "to show that a number of Milton's

ideas, by some scholars attributed to specific sources, were shared by his contemporaries," and it is a pity that he does not believe enough in his own laudable thesis. When he insists, as he does far too often, that we substitute his new sources for those just discredited, his own good logic backfires. The book must be read but read with unusual caution, for the author omits much, too often overlooks the work of other scholars, trips on his own logic, and invalidates even his most useful conclusions by widespread inaccuracy (in at least one set of parallel passages adding a word to Milton's text and then remarking "the similarity of phrasing," p. 289, line 6).

These generalizations may be illustrated from the chapter on *Eikonoklastes*. Whiting profitably demonstrates that most of the parallels cited by Lowenhaupt from *Eikon Alethine* "have little weight when one examines the language of other books and documents," but concludes that these *other* books "seem to be Milton's real sources" and lists thirty-seven parallels of his own. May's *History of Parliament* particularly shows "Milton's heavy indebtedness." Must we assume, however, that Milton turned to May for information when he probably had access to the great collection of tracts being made by his friend Thomason (who, it is to be remembered, published May's *History*)? Surely Milton could have found his data in the same ready "sources" used by May. Milton, moreover, was sufficiently aware of current events not to need "sources" for many of the statements which Whiting cites. For example, in parallel 17 Milton says, "such word was sent us," and May says, "it was usually talked among the people of that time"—and Whiting omits both these statements from his quotations. More serious is the author's failure to realize that Milton's passages in italics are quoted. In number 37 Milton carefully quotes three words from *The Kings Cabinet*, and we are supposed to note "verbal parallelism." There are three other instances of such misinterpretation of Milton's intent (nos. 1, 13, 36), and three instances in which Whiting fails to reproduce the italics of the original (nos. 10, 13, 24).

WILLIAM R. PARKER

*The Ohio State University*

---

*Perilous Balance: The Tragic Genius of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne.*

By W. B. C. WATKINS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 172. \$2.00.

"All three waged a lifelong battle against disease, melancholia, tragedy. Swift, at one extreme, surrendered to savage disillusion and despair; at the other, Sterne deliberately cultivated illusion and gaiety in order to fence against the evils of this world. John-

son by self-discipline and will power maintained a difficult and perilous balance."

"Swift's melancholia is the melancholia of Hamlet, and its root is very much the same—a dichotomy of personality expressing itself in an abnormal sensitivity to the disparity between the world as it should be and the world as one sees it."

These passages give fairly enough the formula of Mr. Watkins's brief but distinctly ambitious critical study. The results are about what one could predict. His judgments concerning the central figure (Johnson) are orthodox and will be found generally acceptable, but in order to complete the symmetry of the scheme he has had to make Swift considerably more noble and Sterne considerably more wise than accepted verdict allows. Readers will probably have some skepticism themselves as to the absolute validity of theses which cause Mr. Watkins to accuse Cross of "wilful skepticism" and to declare that Quintana and Eddy are mistaken. But a reader does not, or at least should not, ask whether the formula, abstractly stated, is false or true. The formula is merely a device for grappling swiftly with the biography of three men and reducing parts of the evidence to order. The question is, does the impressionistic (Mr. Watkins calls it "partial") portrait which emerges seem, on the whole, lifelike? Or is the simplification (or distortion) so great that, though a fine work of art, one had better call it a fancy piece? By this test I think it will be generally agreed that Mr. Watkins has succeeded very well. I am really not at home in either Sterne or Swift, and can only record my impression that these chapters, in spite of their somewhat strenuous ingenuity, give a critical synthesis that any one can read with pleasure and that even a specialist can steal lecture material from. I should give that verdict with considerable confidence for the three chapters dealing with Johnson. Mr. Watkins has read the biographical sources widely and sensitively, and has shown a high degree of skill in making so large a number of quotations behave. There are some slips: Johnson did not ask himself whether he could ever *read* but whether he should ever *receive* the Sacrament with tranquillity (pp. 55, 57); Mr. Geoffrey Scott has shown beyond all doubt that Boswell did not ordinarily carry a notebook and that he did not take notes on the spot (*Private Papers of James Boswell*, vol. VI); I have pointed out the extreme improbability that Poll Carmichael was the prostitute whom Johnson carried home and sheltered (*Ibid.*, XVIII, 314); Sir John Hawkins's theory to account for Johnson's violent remorse of conscience was not a "rash assumption on the basis that Johnson knew intimately a man of dissolute morals," that is, Savage. Hawkins may have been mistaken, but he believed he had the evidence of Johnson's diary for his statement (*Private Papers*, XVI, 84). See my note printed on pp. 325-9 of this issue.

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

Yale University

*A Concordance to the Poetry of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* Edited by SISTER EUGENIA LOGAN, S. P. Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana: 1940. Pp. xvi + 901. \$10.00.

*A Concordance to the Poems of Sidney Lanier, including the Poem Outlines and certain uncollected items.* By PHILIP GRAHAM and JOSEPH JONES. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1939. Pp. vi + 447. \$3.50.

Let us say of Sister Eugenia Logan's work what must be said of a good concordance to a significant poet: it is a boon to all students of the poet and his age, and indeed of the English language and literature as a whole. No student of Coleridge dare risk omitting it from his workshop. After the text on which it is based, Ernest Coleridge's edition of his grandfather's poetry, 1912, the Concordance is the most important tool in that shop. It is not perfect, yet so helpful that I proceed to bury my adverse criticisms of the work in the middle of this review.

In the main, the variant readings are carefully noted. There is, however, too much repetition of identical lines from earlier and later versions of the same poem; for example, from *Osorio* and *Remorse*. Here a given line should have been recorded once, with two references to titles and places; for *The Dungeon* (from *Osorio*), three references are needed, and not merely a record of variant readings in this piece. As for omissions, Sister Eugenia has failed to note Miss Snyder's list of variant readings in a manuscript of *Kubla Khan* (*Times Literary Supplement*, London, Aug. 2, 1934); and she did not catch Coleridge's lines to his shaving-pot (in *William Blackwood and his Sons*, by Mrs. Oliphant, second edition, 1897, I, 421). Ernest Coleridge did not catch the amusing "Sonnet" (of 22 lines) either; neither text nor Concordance is much hurt by the loss.

In recording *I*, *mine*, and *my*, Sister Eugenia should have kept only the references to Coleridge himself. There are pages of *I* from *Osorio*, *Remorse*, *Zapolya*, and *The Fall of Robespierre*. Of misprints I note the following. Under *Dragon*, 'in' is omitted from *France* 57; under *Should*, for 'shoud' read 'should' in *Kubla Khan* 48; on the same page (684), for the head-word *Shiuldered* read *Shouldered*. The worst thing I have found is a quotation for *Ambush* amid those for *Amber*. On page 112 there is disorder in the references under the head-word *Christ*; one-third the way through the quotations for it, this heading is repeated, and then followed by 'See *Anti-Christ*.' There should be reference back and forth between *Esthese*, one instance, and *S. T. C.*, of which there are six. And it would have been better in all such references across to depart from the usage of my Concordance to Wordsworth by printing "See also." The Index, p. 901, to "some significant

words occurring in the prefaces, notes, and glosses," is a welcome innovation.

There is less special interest in Coleridge's vocabulary than I thought a concordance would reveal; one reflects that, after all, but a small part of Coleridge's verse is of great importance. His store of words is not as huge as Mr. Lowes imagined, nor, apart from hyphenated compounds, are there as many strange words as Matthew Arnold once led me to expect. To a surprising extent the general run of Coleridge's words taken singly coincides with that of Wordsworth. Wordsworth's vocabulary is the larger, where I have compared the concordances, but not larger than might be anticipated from the larger bulk of his poems; he naturally mentions more things and names, and expresses more ideas, than does his brother-poet.

Some of Coleridge's favorite words were *fancy* (also with compounds), *fear*, *grief*, *holy*, *image*, *spell*, *spirit*. There are many occurrences of *murder* and cognate words. There are fewer references to *grief* and *grieve* than to *joy*, *joyous*, and *joys*. Some eight columns are devoted to *eye* and *eyes*. Most interesting are the compounds. Here are a few taken at random: *amber-glowing*, *boat-god* (Charon), *brother-blight*, *brother-murderer*, *canoe-boat*, *double-wreathed*, *doubt-mingled* (joy), *dragon-eyes*, *dragon-scales*, *dragon-wing'd*, *eye-poisons*, *flower-caressing*, *flower-embroider'd*, *flower-entangled*, *fog-smoke*, *gall-drops*, *giant-born*, *giant-limbs*, *glory-streaming*, *love-bright*, *monarch-murdered*, *pinky-silver*, *ram-devil*, *sabbath-breach*, *silver-bright*, *skiff-boat*, *star-bright*, *tyrant-murdered*, *under-garland*, *winter-bright*.

Sister Eugenia and her helpers are to be congratulated upon the boon she has given to this and succeeding generations. The book is handsome, the print is clear if necessarily small, and the paper, if a little thin, is likely to last if the volume is properly handled. The Dedication is taken from words of the Ancient Mariner:

To Mary Queen the praise be given.

The concordance of Lanier is the second published concordance of an American author, the first having been that for Emerson, compiled by Hubbell (1932). I have heard of one in manuscript for Whitman, and wonder why there is none for Longfellow, who wrote more good poetry than any other American so far. Of course it is always wise for those who are driven to compile works of this sort to choose an earlier and better poet from European literature rather than any poet of this country or, say, Australia. Even in American poetry that of Lanier now seems rather thin. Yet one must not say so to Mr. Graham and Mr. Jones, but give thanks to them for a real gift to scholarship, since Lanier has a following of persons who wish to study him exactly. Now we can do that.

I note that the quotations for *God* occupy two and one-half of the double columns; also that Lanier is a Christian (see *Christ*), but not clearly a Trinitarian (see *Spirit* and *Ghost*). There are many references to *Dream*, *Dreamed*, *Dreamer*, *Dream-field*, *Dreaming*, *Dreams*, *Dream-taught*, *Dream-worker*; all told, about three columns of these words and their quotations. There are a good many hyphenated compounds; *Grain-army* seems to have a hyphen from the editors. In the "cross-references," as "*See also* Governor-spirits," or "Merchant-spirits," the compound words should be like the head-word, in black-faced types, which we need not give in this review. Lanier in his verse does not refer to Poe, Whitman, or Lee, nor to Wordsworth. There is a repeated line (*Clover* 81, 103): "Beethoven, Chaucer, Schubert, Shakespeare, Bach." These references to *Shakespeare* should have been combined with five others to *Shakspeare*. Naturally there are many references to *Marsh* and things connected with marshes. There are more to *Hills* than to *Mind*, which Lanier more often spells without a capital letter, and more to *Hills* than to *Nature*, which he deifies more often than he does *Mind*.

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

---

*George Keate, Esq., Eighteenth Century English Gentleman.* By KATHRYN GILBERT DAPP. Philadelphia, 1939. Pp. viii + 184. (University of Pennsylvania dissertation.)

Except for connoisseurship in pictures and improvement of grounds, George Keate appears to have exhibited every form of tasteful activity and literary fashion which a fairly affluent English gentleman living between 1730 and 1797 could be supposed to. In fact, so perfect a specimen is he that if he had been created by a novelist, he would seem improbable. For Miss Dapp's substantial bibliography of his works, all but a very few of which she has handled, for the letters and fragments of letters (the only one of Keate's which survives as a whole is one to Garrick), and for the information about her subject, Miss Dapp must indeed, as she says, have sought far and wide. A special reason for gratitude to her is her inclusion of the rest of the twenty-seven letters of Voltaire to Keate, now in the British Museum, of which only four have previously been printed. But the chief value of her study is an incredibly complete portrait of the Man of Taste.

Keate knew Edward Young and Voltaire, to both of whom he dedicated poems; Garrick and the elder Colman, who would not listen to his play; Angelica Kauffman, who painted for him; Sir Robert Strange; and Robert Adam (whose ceiling fell down on him

and caused a law-suit). He wrote letters to the Chevalier d'Eon and a poem in defence of Captain Bligh. He admired Shakespeare and had an inkstand from the mulberry tree. He met Dr. Johnson in the company of Boswell and Miss More. He read a Pickwickian paper on some doubtfully Roman pottery before the Society of Antiquaries. He exhibited at the Society of Artists, and Sir Joshua presented him with a Discourse. By his will, Nollekens (whom he knew) made his funerary bust.

Miss Dapp's bibliography of his work is, by implication, a review of the literary fashions of the period covered. Keate's Grand Tour produces a "respectful" view of ancient and modern Rome, a study of Geneva and Liberty, and a loco-descriptive poem, Miltonic, Thomsonian and Ossianic all in one, on the Alps; and though mountains were just then the rage in Paris, it is clear, as Professor Havens remarked in *The Influence of Milton*, that Keate really knew and loved these mountains. Next come an Ovidian amatory epistle, a graveyard piece on Netley Abbey (in Gray's elegiacs), praise of Shakespeare to Voltaire (in time for the Jubilee), and the *Monument in Arcadia* (Poussin and pastoral, *ut pictura poesis*). The *Sketches from Nature* are purified and diluted Sterne. *An Account of the Pelew Islands* tells of Prince Lee Boo (as Professor Fairchild has recounted in *The Noble Savage*), inspires Mrs. West, Joseph Cottle, and even Coleridge to shed poetic tears, and runs to fifteen editions.

ELIZABETH W. MANWARING

Wellesley College

---

*Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to Fanny Cornforth.* Edited by PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 142. \$2.25.

This correspondence adds another touch of irony to Rossetti's story; at last one finds him in actual communication with his mistress, the 'evil genius,' the wholly sensual influence in his life, that wrought such havoc according to his biographers. With trembling fingers one parts the veil:

Dear Fan

Dunn has told me something about which you must not be angry. It seems that poor fawn that Graham sent was in such a state as not to be worth the expense of sending on here, but that you, like a funny old chumpwump, would have it sent. . . . So there is the whole story, you good old thing, and you must not be angry with Dunn or with me.

This sets the tone, and nowhere is there anything more passionate; the manner is exactly that of his letters to his mother, whom he called 'Good Antique.' Fanny is 'Good Elephant.' The

relationship was cosy and comfortable: he consulted her about all his domestic affairs, and told her scraps of news about his 'dear old Mummy' and Christina. When Maria Rossetti became a Sister of Mercy, he explained: 'one of those old things whom you see going about in a sort of coal-scuttle and umbrella costume.'

These letters, which form a part of the Bancroft Collection in the Delaware Art Center, begin in 1870, and end in November, 1881. Mr. Baum gives the date of Fanny's birth as 3 January 1824 (although on the next page he accepts Mr. Bancroft's version of her meeting with Rossetti in 1856, in which she is called 'a young girl' at that time), thus she was forty-six at the outset of this book, and the intimacy already a matter of fifteen years' standing. The importance of the letters is the revelation of Rossetti's dependence on her in her various capacities as housekeeper, seamstress, and even art-agent. The break which came in 1877 was on her initiative, not his, and he is almost abject in his appeals to John Schott, her partner in a public house and later her second husband, for news of her. Mr. Schott's relations with them both were curious, and it is interesting to get the further light that this book gives, although more is needed to make the situation clear. Mr. Baum's editing is always helpful; he is, fortunately, more reliable than his sources, as out of the ten books he lists in his bibliography, eight are notoriously inaccurate and imaginative. However, information of any sort about Fanny Cornforth is difficult to find, a fact which makes the publication of these letters a matter of real moment to any student of Rossetti.

JANET CAMP TROXELL

*New Haven, Connecticut*

---

*The Life and Letters of Henry Cuyler Bunner.* By GERARD E. JENSEN. Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xi + 248. \$3.00.

In the publication of American books and periodicals of the late nineteenth century New York was the conspicuous leader, publishing far more books than Boston and Philadelphia put together, one-fourth of all the periodicals in the country and two-thirds of the most widely circulated ones. Professor Mott estimates that between 1865 and 1885 the number of periodicals multiplied by more than four and one-half times and that in all eight or nine thousand periodicals were issued in these twenty years.<sup>1</sup> Very few, if any, of the swarm of magazine writers and editors of the period were more active or knew more fellow-authors than Henry Cuyler Bun-

<sup>1</sup> Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, Volume III: 1865-1885*, Harvard University Press, 1938, p. 5.

ner (1855-1896). Happily, Professor Jensen does not try to make of Bunner a major writer. He justifiably acknowledges him to have been a versatile and clever writer of familiar verse, influenced by Austin Dobson; he grants him skill and influence equal to that of Stockton and Aldrich in writing witty and polished short stories in miniature ("to be read while the candle burns"); and he sketches his successful career as editor for eighteen years of the first long-lived comic journal in the United States, the weekly *Puck* (1877-1918).

The book, however, is not important primarily as a biography or a critical interpretation of Bunner as a writer. It consists of a twelve-page biographical introduction, one hundred and fifty pages of selected Bunner letters arranged chronologically with interspersed annotations supplied by Professor Jensen, and five concluding essays: "Bunner's Character," "The Man of Letters," "The Poet," "The Editor," and "The Short-Story Writer." Chapters I, II, XVI, and XVII could be omitted without significant loss. The remaining portions, especially the annotated letters, introduce the reader to a multitude of minor writers (mostly of New York) of the late nineteenth century—men like Brander Matthews, Stedman, Lathrop, Gilder, Stockton, Julian Hawthorne, Warner, Gibson, Cable, Riley, Hutton, etc. The reader who will supplement the biography with Matthews' *These Many Years* (1917), *Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman* (1910), Gilder's *Letters* (1916), and E. P. Mitchell's *Memoirs of an Editor* (1924) will be richly rewarded.

The chief value of Professor Jensen's book is to be derived from the many instructive details it contains about a prolific minor writer, and, more important, the incidental information it gives about Bunner's numerous literary associates. This information is not sufficient or coherent enough to make the book, by itself, a literary history of New York during the third quarter of the nineteenth century; nevertheless, it is one contribution toward such a history, which probably cannot be adequately written until at least half a dozen other writers of the time and place have been similarly treated.

HERMAN E. SPIVEY

University of Florida

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*The Growth of Literature*, vol III. By H. M. and N. K. CHADWICK. Cambridge: at the University Press [New York: Macmillan], 1940. Pp. xxvi + 928. \$9.00. With the present volume Professor and Mrs. Chadwick finish a monumental survey of "oral

literature" in many languages, a survey running to more than 2,400 closely printed pages. Vol. I (1932; see *MLN.*, XLIX, 438 f.) was devoted to "the ancient literatures of Europe," Greek, Germanic and Celtic; vol. II (1936; see *MLN.*, LIII, 235 f.) dealt with Russian oral literature, Yugoslav oral poetry, and early Hindu and Hebrew literature; vol. III takes up the oral literature of the Tartars, and of certain Polynesian and African peoples, and includes, besides, a 12-page "note on English ballad poetry" and a 207-page "general survey" in which all the material considered in the three volumes is reviewed afresh. On the other hand, no general index is provided; each volume has its own. Now that the work is done, one feels more than ever that its title is unhappy. In this *magnum opus*, the authors are not concerned with literature in the ordinary sense; they examine "speakings" rather than writings. Nor are they primarily concerned with any process of growth; they describe, analyze and classify their material first of all, and in most cases they do no more. Certainly they do not tell the story of the growth of literature; the promise of their title remains unfulfilled. But we must not hold this against them. We are too deeply in their debt for that. They have given us a systematic account of a vast body of material, old and new, an account which we can use in our study of writings as well as in our further study of "speakings." In particular, their huge collection of examples, gleaned from many parts of the earth, will correct the perspective of the specialist and broaden his horizon. The authors have spent nearly twenty years on their gigantic task. The time was well spent. We congratulate them on an achievement of the first rank.

K. M.

---

*An Analysis of the Long Prayers in Old French Literature with Special Reference to the 'Biblical-Creed-Narrative' Prayers.* By SISTER MARIE PIERRE KOCH. Dissertation of the Catholic University of America, Washington, 1940. Pp. 204. *Patiente étude collectionnant toutes les longues 'prières épiques' (prières-credo) dans la littérature narrative du moyen âge français (42 exemples dans 62 textes considérés)—un travail analogue avait été entrepris par une autre élève de la Catholic University pour l'ancien espagnol. Quand Sister Marie Pierre affirme: "no serious study of length has been done on the long prayers in Old French . . .," elle semble ignorer les discussions, s'étendant sur les années de 1931 à 1934 (quatre articles dans *ZRPh.*), entre M. Scheludko et moi. Au moins pour le travail de mon contradicteur, je me permettrais de revendiquer l'épithète "sérieux," puisqu'il me semble avoir définitivement élucidé et le problème de la source de ces prières épiques (des prières d'exorcisation latines, parallèles à la *commendatio animae* et remontant à une tradition très ancienne dans la chrétienté) et celui de la transformation artistique que les poètes*

ont fait subir à ces textes assez sommaires (d'après M. Scheludko le poète du *Couronnement Louis* serait le premier en date à donner la richesse des détails aux listes de miracles divins). Sister Marie Pierre cite, d'une façon plus vague, quelques-uns de ces textes et insiste sur le caractère gallican de cette "popular devotion" (les prières épiques manquant en allemand)—ce qui ne me paraît pas encore suffisamment prouvé.

LEO SPITZER

## CORRESPONDENCE

LOCOMOTIVE ET AUTOMOBILE. E. Lerch, "Aristoteles, die Lokomotive und das Automobil." *Studia neophilologica*, XII, 3 (Upsal 1940), p. 210-236. Sous ce titre sentant un peu le journalisme, M. Lerch réussit à expliquer les mots techniques modernes en dernier lieu par le terme aristotélicien *τὸ κινητικὸν κατὰ τὸν* 'la faculté de mouvement' (donnée aux animaux et à l'homme au contraire des plantes et des minéraux), que S. Thomas d'Aquin rend par *motivum secundum locum*, Oresme par *la (puissance) motive de lieu en autre* et l'humaniste Argyropoulos par *loco motivum* (avec un ablatif *loco* = 'selon le lieu'): en Angleterre on avit parlé au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle de la *locomotive faculty (power)* comme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> de la *faculté locomotive*—c'est en Angleterre que *locomotive engine* (opposé à *stationary engine*) se trouve depuis la découverte de la locomotion par la vapeur (1815), et le mot abrégé *locomotive* depuis 1829. Les autres pays suivent. La (voiture) *automobile* suit la *locomobile*, mot formé d'après *locomotive*, et le préfixe *auto-* vient du mot *automate*, attesté d'abord dans Rabelais. *Autobus* est d'abord une formation anglaise.

Je crois que le transfert *locomotive faculty* > *locomotive engine* ne s'explique pas seulement par l'idée de la locomotion commune à l'homme (selon la définition aristotélicienne) et à la nouvelle machine, mais aussi par la notion de *force agissante* qu'exprimait l'épithète *locomotive*: il faut se rappeler que *power* lui-même a en anglais (depuis 1671) le sens de 'machine qui transforme une énergie en force mécanique' (de là *power plant*, *power house* pour les institutions urbaines qui produisent l'électricité et le gaz, mots traduits en all. sous la forme de *Kraftanlage*). Je suppose donc que *locomotive engine* est un abrégé (peut-être seulement mental) de *\*locomotive power-engine*—l'expression puriste de l'all.: *Kraftwagen* offre un témoignage valide à cette supposition. A noter qu'en Allemagne le mot *Wagen* (comme en anglais *car*) tend à supplanter dans la parlure courante *Auto*, qui devient de plus en plus une voiture publique (comme le *taxi*): on dira *wir fahren mit dem (unserem) Wagen dorthin*. L'aversion contre les mots savants est évidemment plus forte en Allemagne et en Angleterre qu'en France (cf. (*Fahr*)*rad*—*bicyclette*).

Je crois que la spécialisation de *locomobile* pour des machines travaillant sur place (alors qu'encore en 1869 la *locomobile routière* alterne avec la *locomotive routière*) s'explique par une retraduction latinisante de 'sur

place' en *loco*- (cf. *loco* = 'en ville') : j'ai montré dans *Le fr. mod.*, VIII, pour *photogénique*, comment le rapport des deux membres d'une composition savante est souvent réinterprété selon des besoins nouveaux se faisant sentir dans la communauté parlante.

L'objection de M. L. contre *automobile*, consistant à nier à *mobile* le sens de 'ce qui se meut,' est évidemment erronée: Littre a en premier lieu l'explication de *mobile*: 'qui se meut ou qui peut être mû' (*garde, couleur mobile* etc.); de même en all. on se sert du mot d'emprunt *mobil* p. ex. à propos d'un vieillard encore remuant. Les philosophes anciens avaient déjà cette conception, v. Lalande, *Voc. de la phil.*, s. v. *mobile* "ce qui peut être mû."—Spécialement, chez Aristote, toute chose est appelée *mobile* (*κινούμενον*) en tant qu'elle change et *moteur* (*κινούν*) en tant qu'elle cause le changement. Le *premier mobile* (*πρῶτον κινούμενον*, L. *primum mobile*) est le ciel supérieur, ou "premier ciel," qui est à son tour le moteur de tout ce qui existe dans le monde." Lachelier ajoute qu'un texte d'Aristote distingue un moteur immobile (*ἀκίνητον*) objet du désir; un mobile qui devient à son tour moteur (*τὸ κινούν καὶ κινούμενον*), le désir; enfin un mobile simplement tel (*κινούμενον*), notre corps. L'*automobile* est au fond, au sens aristotélicien, un mobile-moteur, un *κινούν καὶ κινούμενον*, puisque mouvant et mû (par une force qui la pousse, soit sur le plan physique, par le 'moteur,' soit sur le plan humain, par notre désir). Le préfixe *auto-* tiré d'*automate* (terme grec lui-même: *τὸ αὐτόματον* au sens moderne se trouve déjà chez Héron, cf. Lalande) est dû à une illusion volontaire de l'homme qui fait semblant d'avoir construit, espèce de Dieu, une machine indépendante de lui: l'*automate* est un 'appareil imitant par un mécanisme intérieur les mouvements d'un être vivant,' dit Lalande. L'*automobile* tend à réunir deux conceptions diamétralement opposées: le mobile-moteur et l'*automate*—*automate* n'aurait pas contenté l'homme moderne en voie de dénommer un appareil qui change de place. Le préfixe *auto-* si humain et si volontaire (*autonomie, autocratie*, etc.) insufflait une volonté propre à la machine, le membre *-mate* mécanique devait tomber. Le terme *automobile* est donc un document excellent de cette attitude du créateur admirant béatement sa création, qu'est l'homme technique moderne.

Le nom de l'*Automobile-Club de France* (fondé en 1895) est évidemment un anglicisme, comme le suggère dubitativement M. Lerch à la note 2 de la p. 226: mais le modèle direct n'est pas *Modern Cinéma, Athletic Club*, etc., mais plus particulièrement le *Touring-Club de France* (je trouve dans E. Bonnaffé, *Dict. des Anglicismes*, une *Revue du Touring-Club de France* en 1891).

Le neutre de l'all. *das Auto* s'expliquera non seulement par l'analogie phonétique de *das Kilo, das Piano*, mais par le prédécesseur immédiat de l'*automobile*: *das (Fahr)rad* (*Bycicle, Velo*). L'anglicisme du mot *autobus* (que soutient aussi Abel Hermant, "Chroniques de Lancelot," 1933, p. 123) me semble aussi appuyé par le fait que les *porte-manteau* words sont un des traits caractéristiques de la langue anglaise.

A ajouter à l'histoire des formations avec le préfixe *auto-* les remarques de M. Migliorini dans *Arch. glott. it.* XXVII (1935), p. 15.

LEO SPITZER

May

RE

[Th

Carv  
Cycle.  
N. Y.

Dav  
in fac  
Henry  
lery,  
Clare  
Press,

Gar  
names  
Hump  
Press)

Gov  
voyag  
critici  
annot  
ages  
umbia  
(Colu  
Lit.,

Her  
lish m  
tion c  
porat

Hod  
man,  
York  
Pp. x  
Gener

Ho  
ter, s  
Halli  
Press  
Lost

Irvi  
Oldst  
editio  
Stanl  
U. P.  
simil

Ma  
Yeats  
Press

Ro  
King  
series  
Lond  
Oxf

Tu  
Saga  
York  
\$3.00

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Carver, James E.—*The Northern Homily Cycle*. Abridgment of diss. *New York*: N. Y. U., 1941. Pp. ii + 18.

Davies, Sir John.—The poems. Reproduced in facsimile from the first editions in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, with an introduction and notes by Clare Howard. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941. Pp. x + 250. \$3.00.

Gardiner, Alan H.—The theory of proper names, a controversial essay. *London*: Humphrey Milford [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. 67. \$1.75.

Gove, Philip Babcock.—The imaginary voyage in prose fiction, a history of its criticism and a guide for its study, with an annotated check list of 215 imaginary voyages from 1700 to 1800. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 445. \$3.50. (Columbia U. Studies in Eng. and Comp. Lit., 152.)

Henkin, Leo J.—Darwinism in the English novel, 1860-1910, the impact of evolution on Victorian fiction. *New York*: Corporate Press, 1940. Pp. 303. \$3.00.

Hodges, John C.—William Congreve, the man, a biography from new sources. *New York*: Mod. Lang. Ass'n. of America, 1941. Pp. xviii + 151. \$2.00. (Mod. Lang. Ass'n., General Series, xi.)

Howard, Bronson.—*The Banker's Daughter*, and other plays. Edited by Allan G. Halline. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 306. \$5.00. (America's Lost Plays, x.)

Irving, Washington.—Letters of Jonathan Oldstyle. Reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1824, with an introduction by Stanley T. Williams. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1941. Pp. xxx + 67. \$1.60. (Facsimile Text Society, 52.)

MacNeice, Louis.—The poetry of W. B. Yeats. *London* [*New York*]: Oxford U. Press, [1941]. Pp. xii + 242. \$2.50.

Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom.—Essays by divers hands. New series, xviii. Edited by St. John Ervine. *London*: Humphrey Milford [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. xvi + 165. \$2.75.

Turville-Petre, G. (ed.).—*Víga-Glúms Saga*. *London*: Humphrey Milford [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. lvi + 112. \$3.00. (Oxford English Monographs.)

The Year's Work in English Studies, XIX, 1938.—Edited for the English Association by Frederick S. Boas. *London*: Humphrey Milford [*New York*: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. 275. \$3.75.

## GERMAN

Bacmeister, Ernst.—Die Tragödie ohne Schuld und Sühne. *Wolfshagen-Scharbentz*: Westphal [1940]. 30 pp. M. 1.50.

Becker, Albert.—Goethes Wölfehen und Heidelberg. Tragik des grossen Namens. Mit 11 z. Teil unveröffentlichten Abbildungen. [Beiträge zur Heimatkunde der Pfalz. 2]. *Heidelberg*: Weiss, 1940. 40 pp. M. 1.50.

Becker, Karl August.—Wir wandern mit August Becker. Die Schauplätze seiner Dichtungen. [Mit 22 Bildern aus alter und neuer Zeit und Zeichnungen von August Becker]. *Neustadt a. d. Weinstr.*: Meininger, 1940. 47 pp. M. 1.20.

Benz, Richard.—Die deutsche Romantik. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung. 2. durchges. Aufl. *Leipzig*: Reclam [1940]. 487 pp. 6 plates. M. 8.

Bizer, Hermann.—Die Flurnamen von Tailfingen. *Tailfingen*: Selbstverlag, 1940. 134 pp., 1 plate.

Bock, Rudi.—Das Verhältnis von Dichtung und Datentreue in den historischen Dramen Grabbes. Diss. Greifswald. *Kolberg*: Post, 1940. 114 pp.

Brentano, Peter Anton von.—Schattenzug der Ahnen der Dichtergeschwister Clemens und Bettina Brentano. *Regensburg*: Josef Habbel, 1940. 141 pp., 24 + 2 plates. M. 5.80.

Clostermeier, Louise Christiane.—Ein Briefwechsel zwischen Louise Christiane Klostermeier und Dr. Gustav Klemm. Nach den Hs. im Lippischen Landesarchiv in Detmold zum 1. Male hrsg. v. Alfred Bergmann. Mit 1 Bildnis Klemms u. 1 Faks. d. Hs. d. Demoiselle Klostermeier. [Grabbe-Privatdrucke. Nr. 4]. *Detmold*: E. Schnelle, 1940. 39 pp. 4°. M. 4.

Eichenberger, Ewald.—Beitrag zur Terminologie des Walliser "bisses." Diss. *Zürich*. *Aarau*: Sauerländer, 1940. 103 pp.

Fehrle, Hans.—Die Eligius-Sage. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1940. 199 pp. 4 plates. M. 6.40.

Fehse, Wilhelm.—Raabe und Jensen. Denkmal einer Lebensfreundschaft. *Berlin*: Grote, 1940. 182 pp. M. 3.

Fenz, Egon.—Laut, Wort, Sprache und ihre Deutung. Grundlegung einer Lautdeutungslehre. *Wien*: Deuticke, 1940. vi, 179 pp. M. 8.

Frey, Heinrich.—Die Flur-, Wege- und Schneisennamen der Gemarkung Arheilgen. Diss. *Marburg*. [Hessisches Flurnamenbuch.

H. 17]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1940. 66 pp. 1 map. M. 3.

Geissler, Günter.—Dietrich Vorwerk. Ein Dichter der Gegenwart, wie ihn ein junger Deutscher sieht. *Berlin*: F. Linke, 1940. 52 pp.

Gottschald, Max.—Die deutschen Personennamen. [Sammlung Götschen. Bd. 422]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1940. 134 pp. M. 1.62.

Greyerz, Otto von.—Sprachpillen. N. F. *Bern*: Francke, [1940]. 128 pp. Fr. 5.

Happe, Marianne.—Die Tiroler Bauernwelt in Karl Schönherr's Dichtungen. Diss. Münster. *Innsbruck*: Deutscher Alpenverlag [1940]. 107 pp.

Hartmann, Ursula.—Typen dichterischer Selbstbiographien in den letzten Jahrzehnten. Diss. *Breslau*. *Bonn*: Brand, 1940. 115 pp.

Hebbel-Jahrbuch.—Im Auftrag der Hebbelgemeinde hrsg. durch Detlef Cölln. [Jg. 2]. *Heide*: Westholstein. Verl.-Anst. [1940]. 127 pp., 2 plates. M. 2.40.

[Hecker, Jutta].—Haec otia fecit. Verzeichnis der von Professor Dr. Max Hecker, dem Archivar des Goethe- u. Schiller-Archivs, verf. u. hrsg. Schriften u. Aufsätze. (Dem Siebzigjährigen am festlichen sechsten April 1940 . . . zugeeignet vom Insel-Verl.). *Leipzig*: Insel-Verl. 1940. 42 pp. 200 copies.

Hesselbacher, Karl.—Gott lass uns Dein Heil schauen! Leben und Schaffen des Wandsbeker Boten Matthias Claudius. 1.-3. Tsd. *Leipzig*: Schloessmann [1940]. 173 pp. M. 3.50.

Hofmann-Heidelberg, Karl.—Max Schneckenburger und seine "Wacht am Rhein." Geschichte eines deutschen Volks- u. Vaterlandsliedes. [Aus: Tuttlinger Heimatblätter]. *Tuttlingen*: Bofinger, 1940. 16 pp.

Jenner, D.—Sieben Jungen und ein Hund. From a Story by Kurt Riemann. [Oxford Rapid-reading German Texts, Series C]. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1941. 48 pp. \$0.30.

Kaiser, Kurt.—Schlesische Possendichtung in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Diss. *Breslau*. *Trebnitz, Schlesien*: Maretzke & Martin, 1940. 98 pp.

Klepper, Jochen.—Der christliche Roman. *Berlin*: Eckart-Verl. 1940. 29 pp. 75 Pf.

Knauss, Otto.—Die Entstehung der Grünberger Familiennamen. Diss. [Giessener Beiträge zur dt. Philologie. 74]. *Giessen*: von Münchow, 1940. 107 pp. M. 2.80.

Korff, Hermann August.—Geist der Goethezeit. Versuch einer ideellen Entwicklung der klassisch-romantischen Literaturgeschichte. T. 3: Romantik: Frühromantik. *Leipzig*: J. J. Weber, 1940. xi, 627 pp. M. 16.

Krogmann, Willy.—Vom Fräulein aus Britannia. Anna von der Bretagne im

deutschen Lied. Mit 2 Abbildungen und 2 Notenbeigaben. [Schriftenreihe der Deutschen Gesellschaft für keltische Studien. H. 7]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1940. 43 pp. M. 1.50.

[Lachmann, Eduard.—Die Natur des Demetrius. [Frankfurter Quellen u. Forschungen zur german. u. roman. Philologie. H. 27]. Diss. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1940. 90 pp. M. 2.80.

Langenbeck, Curt.—Wiedergeburt des Dramas aus dem Geist der Zeit. Eine Rede. *München*: Albert Langen, 1940. 54 pp. M. 2.

Martini, Fritz.—Heinrich von Kleist und die geschichtliche Welt. [Germanische Studien. H. 225]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1940. 136 pp. M. 5.40.

Mörke, Eduard.—Der Schatz, edited by Paul G. Schroeder. *Denver, Col.*: Smallwood Press [1941]. v, 113 pp.

Morgan, Donald P.—Heinrich von Kleists Verhältnis zur Musik. Diss. *Köln*: Orthen, 1940. 106 pp.

[Nibelungenlied, Das. Hrsg. v. Karl Bartsch. 10. Aufl. Bearb. v. Helmut de Boor. [Deutsche Klassiker des Mittelalters. Bd. 3]. *Leipzig*: Brockhaus, 1940. xxxviii, 389 pp. M. 6.50.

Nitschack, Karl-Heinz.—Georg Gustav Fülleborn (1769-1803). Ein Beitrag zur schlesischen Literaturgeschichte. Diss. *Breslau*. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1940. 100 pp.

Paulsen, Wolfgang.—Adalbert Stifter und der Nachsommer. [Reprint from: *Corona*]. *Durham, N. C.*: Duke Univ. Press, 1941. Pp. 228-251.

Petermann, Margit.—Verena Federer. Die Geschichte ihres Lebens. [*Freiburg*: Herder, 1940]. 18 pp. 20 Pf.

Petsch, Robert.—Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft. Aufsätze zur Begründung der Methode. [Germanische Studien. H. 222]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1940. 274 pp. M. 10.

[Pfeiffer-Belli, Wolfgang.—Die asiatische Banise. Studien zur Geschichte des höfisch-historischen Romans in Deutschland. [Germanische Studien. H. 220]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1940. 193 pp. M. 7.80.

Quint, Josef.—Neue Handschriftenfunde zur Überlieferung der deutschen Werke Meister Eckharts und seiner Schule. Ein Reisebericht. [Meister Eckhart. Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke. Untersuchungen. Bd. 1]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1940. xv, 292 pp. 4°. M. 9.

Reifferscheidt, F. M.—Deutsche Spott- und Streichschriften. *Stuttgart*: Klett, 1940. 336 pp. M. 6.50.

Roggeveen, Leonhard.—Der Radio-Detektiv. Edited by D. Jenner. Authorized Edition. [Oxford Rapid-reading German Texts, Series B]. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1941. 62 pp. \$0.30.

**Schirokauer, Arno.**—Der zweite Merseburger Zauberspruch. [Reprint from: *Corona*]. Durham, N. C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1941. Pp. 117-141.

**Schmidt, Kurt Oskar.**—Der Wandel des Naturgefühls in der erzählenden Dichtung der Gegenwart. Vom Erleben des Eigen- und Grenzbodens. [Schriften d. Albertus-Univ. Geisteswiss. Reihe, Bd. 28]. Diss. *Königsberg*: Ost-Europa-Verl. 1940. v, 154 pp. M. 5.80.

**Schröder, Edward.**—Grundgesetze für die Komposition der altdutschen Personennamen. [Nachrichten v. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Philol.-hist. Kl. Fachgr. 4, N. F. Bd. 3, Nr. 2]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940. pp. 17-36. M. 1.

**Schütze, Gertrud.**—Mörikes Lyrik und die Überwindung der Romantik. Diss. Münster. *Oberhausen*: Vereinigte Verlagsanstalten, 1940. 208 pp.

**Schultz, Franz.**—Klassik und Romantik der Deutschen. T. 2: Wesen und Form der klassisch-romantischen Literatur. [Epochen der deutschen Literatur. Bd. 4, T. 2]. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1940. M. 12.

**Schulz, Hans Hermann.**—Das Volkturns-erlebnis des Arbeiters in der Dichtung von Gerrit Engelke, Heinrich Lersch und Karl Bröger. (Ein Beitrag zur Morphologie des Problems.). Diss. Berlin. [Stadion. Bd. 5]. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1940. 51 pp. M. 2.40.

**Schwietering, Julius.**—Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters. [Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft.]. Potsdam: Athenaeon [1941]. 311 pp. 12 plates. 4°. M. 26.50.

**Sitte, Eberhard.**—Die Datierung von Lamprechts Alexander. [Hermaea. 35]. Diss. Halle: Niemeyer, 1940. 139 pp. M. 6.

**Speck, Johannes.**—Johann Hinrich Fehrs. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung des niederdeutschen Dichters und seines Werkes. [Sachsenspiegel. H. 2]. Berlin: R. Pfau, 1940. 48 pp. M. 1.80.

**Srbik, Heinrich von.**—Goethe und das Reich. (Vortrag). Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1940. M. 1.80.

**Thost, Hermann.**—Nachlass-Studien zu Herder. 1. Leipzig: Poeschel & Trepte [1940]. 140, 32 pp., 3 facsimiles. M. 10.

**Tykiel, Johannes.**—Die Weltanschauung Christian Friedrich Daniel Schubarts (1739-1791). Diss. Breslau: Nischkowsky, 1940. 100 pp.

**Vail, Curtis D.**—Graded German Short Stories, Edited. New York: Oxford Univ. Press [1941]. ix, 240 pp. \$1.25.

**Wacker, Wilhelm.**—Matthias Claudius. Ein Gedenkblatt zur 200 jährigen Wiederkehr des Geburtstages des Wandsbecker Boten im Jahre 1940. 7. erw. Aufl. Breklum: Missionsbuchhandlung [1940]. 23 pp. 20 Pf.

**Wahnes, Günther H.**—Dietrich Eckart in Thüringen. Weimar: Fink [1940]. 38 pp. M. 1.

**Walter, geb. Schulze-Moebius, Brigitte.**—Friedenssehnsucht und Kriegsabschluss in der deutschen Dichtung um 1650. Diss. Breslau: Nischkowsky, 1940. 91 pp.

**Wegemann, G.**—Die Flurnamen des Kreises Eckernförde. Kiel: Mühlau, 1940. iii, 101 typewritten pp. M. 4.

**Weisberger, Joh. Leo.**—Theudisk. Der deutsche Volksname und die westliche Sprachgrenze. [Marburger Universitätsreden. Nr. 5]. Marburg: Elwert, 1940. 60 pp. M. 1.80.

**Wesche, Heinrich.**—Der althochdeutsche Wortschatz im Gebiete des Zaubers und der Weissagung. [Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. H. 1]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1940. 110 pp. M. 7.50.

**Wick, Philipp.**—Die slavischen Lehnwörter in der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. [Berlin-Charlottenburg: Ph. Wick, Steffekstr. 21, 1940]. 107 pp.

**Wiem, Irene.**—Das englische Schrifttum in Deutschland von 1518-1600. [Palaestra 219]. Leipzig: Becker & Erler, 1940. 150 pp. M. 12.

#### FRENCH

**Adler, W.**—Hassdichtung in Frankreich. Berlin: Junker u. Dünnhaupt, 1940. 49 pp.

**Baldensperger, F.**—La littérature fr. entre deux guerres, 1919-39. Los Angeles: Lyman-house, 1941. 206 pp. \$2.25.

**Billardon de Sauvigny.**—Vashington ou la liberté du nouveau monde, ed. G. Chinard and others. Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1941. 117 pp. \$3.50.

**Bleis, B.**—Die Freundinnen des Herzogs von La Rochefoucauld. Jena diss., 1940. xi + 102 pp.

**Capasso dell'Era.**—Sintesi della grammatica francese. Città di Castello: La Tifernate, 1940. 136 pp.

**Cosentina-La Rocca, L.**—Colette. Les animaux dans son œuvre. Caltanissetta: Lipani e Granata, 1939. 121 pp.

**Deinlein, I.**—Der Renaissancetext des Pseudo-Turpin von 1527 u. seine Quellen. Würzburg diss., 1940. 98 pp.

**Dumas.**—Les Trois Mousquetaires, ed. H. R. Kollwijn and A. Coleman. Boston: Heath, 1941. viii + 273 pp.

**Ehrenfels, W.**—Das unanimistische Bewusstsein im Werke Jules Romans'. Griefswald diss., 1940. 139 pp.

**Falk, Paul.**—Comment *Trans* est devenu la marque du superlatif absolu en français. Reprinted from *Studia neophilologica*, XIII, nos. 1, 2, pp. 11-44.

**Humiston, C. C.**—A Comparative Study of the Metrical Technique of Ronsard and

Malherbe. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1941. 180 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Phil., vol. 24.)

Kany and Dondo.—Intermediate Fr. Conversation. *Boston*: Heath, 1941. iv + 60 pp.

La Ferla.—Ippolito Taine. *Milan*: Bietti, 1939. 79 pp.

La Harpe, Jacqueline de.—Le Journal des savants et l'Angleterre, 1702-89. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1941. iv + 232 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Phil., vol. 20.)

Lancaster, H. C.—The Comédie Française, 1680-1701. Plays, Actors, Spectators, Finances. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1941. 210 pp. \$3.00. (J. H. Studies, Extra Vol. 17.)

Lanfredini, D.—Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, 1838-89. *Florence*: Le Monnier, 1940. 179 pp.

La Rocca, L.—Pierre Corneille auteur comique. *Trapani*: Radio, 1939. 136 pp.

Lehmann, G.—Der Einfluss des Judentums auf das frz. Denken der Gegenwart. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1940. 61 pp.

Müller, P. O.—Jules Tellier. Zurich diss., 1939. 120 pp.

Pietsch, Fr.—Der Einfluss der Ethik Corneilles auf seine Zeitgenossen. Erlangen diss., 1940. 123 pp.

Prella-Role, M.—Les Nuits di A. de Musset. *Vercelli*: Gallardi, 1940. 89 pp.

Ricevuto, Fr.—Quelques aperçus sur H. de Balzac. *Trapani*: Radio, 1939. 91 pp.

Rist, P.—Les Joies Nostre Dame des Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie. Zurich diss., 1940. 88 pp.

Scheinfuss, H.—Rousseau. Die Bedeutung der Haltlosigkeit in s. Leben u. Schaffen. Leipzig diss., 1940. 88 pp.

Steiner, R.—Voltaire vom Gesichtspunkt der Geisteswissenschaft. *Basel*: Zbinden u. Hügin, 1940. 37 pp.

Wade, I. O.—Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1941. 255 pp. \$3.00.

### ITALIAN

Bianconi, L.—D'Annunzio critico. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1940. 253 pp.

Calcaterra, C.—V. Alfieri nell'Italia nuova. *Asti*: Centro naz. degli studi alfieriani, 1939. 30 pp.

Cicchitto, L.—Postille bonaventuriano-dantesche. *Roma*: Miscellanea francescana, 1940. 424 pp.

Deutsche Dante-Jahrbuch, hsg. von. Fr. Schneider. Bd. 22, N. F. Bd. 13. *Weimar*: Böhlau, 1940. 196 pp.

Devoto, G.—Storia della lingua di Roma. *Bologna*: L. Cappelli, 1940. 429 pp. con 15 tavv.

Farinelli, A.—Nel mondo della poesia e della musica. Vol. II. *Roma*: Soc. an. Casa ed. nazionale, 1940. 406 pp.

Gaj, M.—Poesia di oggi: Ungaretti, Montale, Pezzani. *Vercelli*: tip. Gallardi, 1940. 26 pp.

Mainenti, P.—La intuizione del mondo nella poesia italiana medievale e moderna (Dante, Petrarca, Boccaccio, Ariosto, Foscolo, Leopardi, Carducci, Graf, Pascoli). *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1940. 176 pp.

Pei, Mario A.—The Italian Language. *New York*: Columbia University Press, 1941. xvi + 272 pp. \$3.00.

Rabetti, A.—Divagazioni manzoniane. *Roma*: Pia Soc. San Paolo, 1940. 404 pp.

Rossani, W.—Sguardo generale alla letteratura italiana del Novecento. *Fiume*: Termini, 1940. 47 pp.

Santoli, V.—I canti popolari italiani. *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1940. 209 pp.

Sparpaglione, D.—Il senso della morte nel Manzoni. *Venezia*: tip. Emiliana editrice, 1939. 38 pp.

Zanghi, R.—La poesia di Giovanni Meli. *Fossano*: tip. G. Eguzzzone, 1940. 15 pp.

### SPANISH

Blasi, F.—Antica poesia epica spagnuola. *Modena*: Soc. tip. Modenese, 1939. 73 pp.

Croce, A.—La "Dorotea" di Lope de Vega. *Bari*: Laterza, 1940. 353 pp.

Duden español. *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Institut, 1940. 868 pp.

Finke, Eichmann, Honecker, Vincke.—Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens. *Münster*: Aschendorff, 1940. 412 pp.

Salinas, Pedro.—Literatura española, Siglo xx. *Mexico*: Lucero, Editorial Séneca [1941]. 352 pp.

### GENERAL

Armstrong, Lilius A.—The Phonetic and Tonal Structure of Kikuyu. *London*: Humphrey Milford [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. xviii + 363 pp. \$4.50.

Atzori, M. T.—La preposizione "de" nel latino volgare. *Florence*: Marzocco, 1939. 181 pp.

Corona. Studies in Celebration of the Eightieth Birthday of Samuel Singer, ed. A. Schirokauer and W. Paulsen. *Durham*: Duke U. Press, 1941. viii + 282 pp. \$4.00.

Deferrari, H. A.—Outline of a Theory of Linguistic Change. *Washington*: 1941. 21 pp. (lithotyped).

Megrath, M.—The Organization and Functioning of Branch Banking in England and Wales. *New York*: Am. Economists Council, 1941. 37 pp.

1941

sia e  
Casa

Mon-  
1940.

ondo  
erna  
Fo-  
coli).

age.  
1941.

iane.  
pp-  
ette-  
Ter-

iani.

orte  
edi-

feli.  
p.

ola.  
pp-

ds

tut,

e. —  
chte

pp.  
ola,  
neca

and  
on:

U.

nel  
1939.

the  
ed.  
m:  
.00.

of  
21

and  
and  
ists

1

e

sa

n-

0.

lo

na

o-

).

re.

l.

e.

.

e-

r-

ni.

te

li-

li.

la.

.

de

t,

—

ce

p.

a,

ea

nd

e:

U.

el

9.

re

l.

:

D.

of

l

d

d

ts

DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI'S  
**LETTERS TO FANNY**  
CORNFORTH

EDITED BY PAUL FRANKLIN BAUM

It has always been known that Fanny Cornforth—whose real name was Sarah Cox, until she married Timothy Hughes—was an important influence in Rossetti's life. She was one of his best models when he was beginning his most characteristic three-quarter-length figure pictures, and next to Mrs. Morris she appears most frequently in his best paintings. She was probably his mistress both before and after his marriage. Not much was revealed about her, however, in the books and articles written by those who actually knew her, and that little was meant, by indirection and innuendo, to give the impression that she was an altogether maleficent influence on his life and his art. Rossetti's family and friends disliked her intensely, doubtless with good reason, as it seemed to them. But Rossetti himself had a genuine, profound affection for her, which these letters make perfectly clear.

*xiii + 142 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$2.25*

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

**CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM IN THE ELIZABETHAN AGE**

WITH ITS BACKGROUND IN MYSTICAL METHODOLOGY

By JOSEPH B. COLLINS, S. S., D. D., PH. D.

This book opens up the uncharted field of Christian mysticism in the literature of sixteenth century England. This period has been looked upon as contributing little to the development of mystical literature, notwithstanding the reasonable inference that mystical writing could not have ended suddenly with the death of Rolle's followers in the fourteenth century, or have begun abruptly later with Crashaw in the seventeenth century. Religious writing in the Elizabethan era was not wholly given over to theological polemic or mere pious hymnology.

In this study mysticism is not vague and diffuse in meaning, but is strictly limited to its traditional methodology in expressing the varied and progressive steps which lead to the "vision splendid." This is the mysticism which is found in Elizabethan literature, and in the treatises of the medieval period which in turn reflect the mysticism of the patristic era. All this is pointed out. And for a fuller view of the method which mysticism developed in the west, the work begins with Plato and Neoplatonism.

Part One treats of the method of mysticism, Part Two reviews the mystical literature of foreign origin in the sixteenth century, and Part Three analyzes the contributions of native English writers from the mystical sonneteers to Edmund Spenser.

*xiv + 251 pages. Octavo, cloth, \$3.25*

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

## NEW ITALIAN TEXTS

### J. L. Russo's SECOND YEAR ITALIAN

An attractive sequel to the author's *First Year Italian*, with an abundance of cultural and informative reading materials and varied exercises, allowing teachers a wide choice for special class needs. In press.

### E. Goggio's A NEW ITALIAN READER FOR BEGINNERS

An introduction to the literature of Italy—historical and cultural selections, modern short stories, simple poems, a short play by Goldoni, essays, etc. With exercises and grammar review. In press.

D. C. HEATH



AND COMPANY

Now Available

## CONCISE FRENCH GRAMMAR

A. B. SWANSON, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

This twenty-seven lesson, objective grammar for the first year of the college course is strikingly brief and clear. Only grammatical phenomena of basic importance are considered. Explanations are made simply and concisely.

Holt

257 Fourth Avenue

New York